THEORY OF CREATION IN MAIN ORTHODOX SCHOOLS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

Thesis submitted to the University of Allahabad for the D. Phil Degree

BY

RUDRAKANTA MISHRA

SUPERVISOR

Dr. A. P. Mishra

Professor & Head of the Department of Sanskrit

University of Allahabad

1973

PREFACE

PREFACE

Late in 1966, and after much discussion, the subject of the present investigation was decided upon. It had the attraction of being a universally interesting topic. And yet, it was found that so far no systematic study of it had been attempted. In the beginning, the scope of this investigation covered all the schools of Indian Philosophy. After some time, it was felt that the subject as such would be unwieldy and that the substance of Indian thought on creation would be perceptible to everyone if only the main orthodox schools were taken up for the present.

My respected Gurūjī, Dr. A. P. Mishra, who has been throughout my educational career literally my "friend, guide and philosopher", and who, in the true orthodox Indian Tradition, has always had characteristically paternal love and care for his even-though-erring pupil, encouraged me by expressing the "hope that the thesis when completed, would be a distinct contribution to philosophical thinking."

In 1967, the University Grants Commission awarded me a Junior Research Fellowship for 3 years. Working under Gurūjī's inspiring guidance my work reached an advanced

stage by about the middle of the year 1970, when my examiners were appointed.

Suddenly, however, I had to leave my research and abandon the Fellowship in September 1970, when I received an appointment for the Lectureship of a degree College at Jaunpur – where I lost all touch with research work due to the utter absence of research facilities there. Eventually, therefore, I had to leave the job.

But, true to the saying <u>prāyo yatra gacchati bhāgyarahitastatraiva yāntyāpadaḥ</u>, various unforeseen personal circumstances and difficulties, which need not be recounted here, did not allow me to rejoin my cherished project for a long time. It was largely due to Gurūji's affectionate encouragement and constant sympathetic inducement that I regained confidence in myself and have now been able to complete the work. Any words, I feel, are too inadequate to express my gratefulness to him.

I am also indebted for their keen interest in my work and useful suggestions for its improvement to Mahāmahopādhyā Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj, my grandfather the late Mahāmahopādhyā Dr. Umesha Mishra, and Dr. Siddheśvara Bhaṭṭāchārya, Besides,

I shall be failing in my duty if I do not mention the unforgettable blessings that I received from my teachers in the Department of Samskrit, University of Allahabad. My friends and admirers from among the research scholars of the Department, both past and present, have always kept up ~~by~~ my spirit under the most trying circumstances that life has made me undergo all these years, and I must thank them for all that they have done for me or shown to me.

I am thankful, also to the staff of the libraries of the Allahabad University, the Benares Hindu University, the G.N.Jhā Kendrīya Saṁskṛta Vidyāpeeṭha, Allahabad and the Visvanātha Pustakālaya, Varanasi, for their assistance during the last seven years.

Last but not least I should like to express my gratitude to Shri P. N. Varma, Samskrit Department, Allahabad University, my able typist who has despite many handicaps worked hard to type out the thesis in just about 2 months' time. In this connection I should like to apologize for the numerous typing errors, particularly those which have

crept in despite our best efforts partly due to the limitations of time and space and partly due to those of the Devanāgarī typewriter. For example, [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] and [illegible] are invariably given as [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] and [illegible]. Besides, [illegible] with [illegible] and [illegible] could not be typed.

In the end, I wish to add that the thesis is now before the distinguished scholars, my examiners, who alone would judge its merit and worth.

Allahabad
Dated: July 31, 1973.

RUDRAKANTA MISHRA

CONTENTS

PREFACE

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION - 1

The Theory of Creation 1, The Schools of Indian Philosophy 8, The Orthodox and the Non-orthodox 10, The Scheme adopted 12.

CHAPTER II: THE SAṂHITĀS - 14

Introduction 13, The First Musings 15, The Mechanical Theory 17, The Theory of 'One' Creator 20, The Sacrificial Theory 26, The Tejas Theory 34, The non-being Theory 43, The Order (Ṛta) of Creation 45, The Will Theory 51, Conclusion 60.

CHAPTER III: THE UPANIṢADS - 65

Introduction 65, The Absolute 66, The Theory of Emanation 72, The Doctrine of the Prāṇa 75, The Concept of Ether 80, The Concept of Air 82, The Concept of Earth 83, The Concept of Water 83, The Concept of Fire 87, The Concept of Organic Nature 89, The Concept of Puruṣa 92, The Concept of Being and Non-being 93, The Concept of Personal God 98, The Concept of Dualism 103, The Concept of Time 106, Conclusion 111.

CHAPTER IV: THE NYĀYAVAIŚEṢIKA - 113

General Background 113, The Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika form one School 114, The Uncreated Substances of the Universe 116, The Non-eternal Substances and the Atomic Theory Involved in Their Production 117, Motion and its Role in Creation (both Physical and Psychic) 120, The Non-eternal Qualities of the Earthly Objects and Process of Chemical Action Involved in Their Production 121, The Non-being and Creation 126, Creation and the Nyāyavaiśeṣika Concept of Causality or Ārambha 127, Universal dissolution and

Creation and the Roles of God and the Law of Karman or Unseen Force therein 134; (A) Isvara 134, (B) Adrsta 136, (C) Pralaya 138, (D) Srsti 141; The Aim of Creation 143; Conclusion 145.

CHAPTER V: THE SAMKHYAYOGA - 149

General Background 149; The Prominence of 'Creation' in the Samkhyayoga School 150; The Concept of Causality (Parinama) 152; (A) A non-entity can never be brought into existence 152, (B) There is a determinate relation between the material cause and the effect 154, (C) Every effect cannot be possible from every cause 154, (D) A competent cause produces only that effect for which it is competent 155, (E) The effect is non-different from the cause 156; The Main kinds of Parinama 161; (A) Dharmaparinama 162, (B) Laksanaparinama 163, (C) Avasthaparinama 163; The Concept of the Unmanifest (avyakta) and the Nature and functioning of the Attributes that constitute it 164; The Uniform Pattern of Parinama during the period of Dissolution (Pralaya) 175; The Purpose and Process of Creation according to the School 176; The Insentient Prakrti as the Creative Factor and its Relationship with the Purusa 182; Vijnanabhiksus View refuted 184; The Order of Creation 185, The Divisions of Creation 192, (A) Pertaining to the Intellect 192, (B) Pertaining to the specific objects 200, (C) Both the above divisions of Creation are necessary and complementary 200, (D) Pertaining to the physical substances or gross elements (Bhautikasarga) 200; Conclusion 202).

CHAPTER VI: THE PŪRVAMĪMĀṀSĀ — 208

General Background 208; No Universal Creation and Dissolution 211; The Process of the Creation of the Non-eternal Realities and the Role of Unseen Force therein 214; The Uncreated Eternal Realities 219; Śakti as the Causal Energy 220; The Non-being and Creation 221; God and Creation 222; Conclusion 231.

CHAPTER VII: THE VEDĀNTA 234

Introduction 234; The Śaṁkara School— The Unqualified reality alone is the origin of creation 235, The concept of causation 242, The role of māyā or avidyā in creation 246, The process of creation and dissolution 248, The purpose of creation 254; The Bhāskara School 255;—Brahman and the concept of causation 255, The order of Creation 262, The purpose of creation 267; The Rāmānuja School 268;—The concept of causation 268,

God and Creation 269, The process of creation 271, The purpose of creation 275;

The Nimbārka School 276;—The concept of causation 276, God and Creation 279, The role of nescience and unseen force in creation 284, The non-conscious realities and creation 287 – (A) Prākṛta 287, (B) Aprākṛta 288, (C) Kāla 288, The process of creation 292, The Purpose of creation 294;— The Mādhva School 296;—the concept of causation 296, The Process of creation and the role of God in it 299, Māyā and Creation 301, The External realities and creation 303, The individual souls and creation 304, The

Periodicity of creation 306, The purpose of creation 307; The Vällabha School; The concept of causation 307; Brahman and the process of creation 312, The purpose of creation 318; Conclusion 321.

CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION 333

The Concept of Knowledge and Reality involved in the Theory of Creation in the Main Orthodox Schools of Indian Philosophy 333; The different Theories being based on the Concept of Adhikārabheda in fact point to the One, Integral Phenomenon of Creation 337; The Concepts of Time and Space as General Background 339; The Concept of Created Universe as a Moral Stage involving the Important Role of the Law of Karman 340; The Concept and Role of God 343.

CHAPTER - I

Introduction

I. The Theory of Creation

It is at first necessary to define the scope of the present investigation on the theory of creation in main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy and to describe the scheme adopted by the present writer in its treatment.

'Theory' here means conceptual knowledge gained about an object of perception or investigation. It may not often be the final or the absolute form of truth or reality, but it has still to be believed in provisionally as such (i.e. as final in its own context) by its believers or followers in order to advance further in the quest of knowledge. There also exists another ~~alternative~~ meaning, besides, according to which a 'finally' established truth or general concept about that object or phenomenon is explained in a regular, consistent and systematic way being well supported according to the propounder or believer (i.e.the 'theorist') either by reasoning, or by direct realisation, or by the words of an authoritative text or individual - or by two or three of them taken

together.

'Creation' can suggest any one of the following senses in the English language. To create means to, "cause something new, original or different[1] ". Creation accordingly stands for:

"(1) the act of God in creating the universe, as the creation of the world.

(2) all that God created; the world, the universe, as the whole creation. Man is sometimes called the lord of creation.

(3) the act of creating by man or by natural forces, conditions etc., as the creation of great works of art; the creation of a new Empire. Economic conditions are often responsible for the creation of social unrest.

(4) the act of giving a rank to, as the creation of peers.

(5) a thing that is created. The creations of the poet, the artist and the writer often bring fame without

---

1. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English by Hornby, Gatenby and Wakefield, Oxford University Press, London, VII impression, 1956 (p.260).

wealth. Irving's Hamlet (i. e. his performance of the part of Hamlet) was a great creation. The women were wearing the newest creations of the Paris dressmakers"[1].

Having acquainted ourselves with the various practical uses or senses of the term 'creation' we would now examine whether and how it suits the tenets of the different schools of Indian Philosophy.

The manifold universe is caused to exist or at least appears as existing through the different happenings and changes in the phenomenal universe to almost all of us. This understanding is the starting point or general background for all the inquirers of the universal truth or reality in its various facets (e. g. those of changing or unmoved and one or many). The preachers of the different schools of Indian Philosophy have also had to explain, as intellectual and enlightened leaders of the masses, the nature of this reality in a consistent and complete or satisfactory manner according to their particular theory or angle of vision based on direct experience.[2]

---

1. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English by Hornby, Gatenby and Wakefield, (Oxford University Press, London, VII impression, 1956) (p. 260).

2. उपदेक्ष्यन्ति ते ज्ञानं ज्ञानिनस्तत्त्वदर्शिनः Bhagavadgita 4.34 and the well-known tradition ऋषयो मन्त्रद्रष्टारः।

In this particular context "creation" does not necessarily mean that everything has a beginning or that something new comes to exist or is caused to exist for that matter, neither does it always stand for the act of a creator God or any other power, not it denotes strictly the act of creating by man or natural forces, conditions etc. alone as noted above. The act of giving a rank to or a poet's or artist's creation is also not the meaning taken here. Creation should be understood in the sense of all that has been created or appears as created whether we accept a Universal Conscious Agent for that purpose or not[1], for, some of the schools do not believe in God as such. The (3), (4) and (5) meanings apparently are totally out of the context in our present study and need not even be discussed.

The basic or universally understood concept[2] of creation which presupposes that whatever exists did not exist previously has actually speaking been accepted by the Nyāyavaiśeṣikas in their ārambhavāda theory but not by the other schools. For example, the Sāṃkhyayoga school believes in satkāryavāda, i.e., 'evolutionary' creation, for, although the vikāras or effects are due to the

---

1. Cf. the meanings (1) and (2) as quoted above from the dictionary which are partly accepted in this definition.

2. Cf. footnote 1 (earlier on p. 2)

pariṇāma i.e., change or activity, the apparent sthūlabhāva or abhivyakti (appearance) and sūkṣmabhāva or tirobhāva (disappearance) of the particular forms assumed by the self-evolving and eternal ultimate cause, viz., the Prakṛti or its sole constituents, viz., the guṇas, are really responsible for the phenomenon of universal creation. Then, the satkāraṇavāda of the Vedānta explains the phenomenal diversity of the creation or universe as ābhāsa or appearance of Brāhman or reality which is immutable, immanent, transcendent and absolute and hence unique in itself. Thus the basic concept of creation as referred to above (at the beginning of this paragraph) is subject to revision and difference of opinion among the philosophical schools of India.

It may be recalled that the Sanskrit word sṛṣṭi as used in Indian Philosophy is all-comprehensive in this respect and stands for all the different shades of treatment of the phenomenon of creation. However, for want of any other suitable English word the term 'creation' has been adopted here. The concept of objects appearing as new, changing or different as aptly suggested by this term in the English usage has remained in fact the most interesting and commonly experienced phase or nature of the universe

or reality which has been so sincerely, thoughtfully and eminently approached from the different standpoints or angles of vision in the different schools of Indian Philosophy.

It may be pointed out that the different schools explain creation in various ways. Creation may be defined as the production of a new form or substance due to the causal operation needing both a conscious agent and inert matter. It may be defined as the law of change or the principle working in nature that has governed the universe eternally and everywhere. It may be said that One God or Highest Soul either by Himself alone or side by side with the jīvas or worldly conscious beings shapes or manifests the inert unmoving objects, again, either out of its own being or out of some external existence or existences because of either his or their playful or selfish motives, or for the good of the jīvas according to their accumulated merits and demerits. It may also be sometimes maintained that as there is only one nirviśeṣa sattā or attributeless reality all appearance otherwise is illusory as in the instance of the rope appearing as serpent.

Creation may, thus, clearly be identified as the reality of or the principle working in, all the varied

universe appearing differently according to the particular attitude of the 'seer' or enquirer; as for example, a skyscraping multistoried building appears totally differently when viewed from various sides, angles or floors. A theory of creation in a school of Indian Philosophy, therefore, is in the highest sense an attempt to visualise or reduce to human intelligence or intuition the whole universe and nothing less. In the context of such an understanding it would not be much out of the way to remark that giving a consistent explanation or theory for the universal phenomenon of creation has really been a difficult problem of paramount importance for all schools of philosophy.

At the end of this discussion it may naturally be concluded that the meaning of the term 'theory of creation' as used here includes the asatkāryavāda of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika, the satkāryavāda of the Sāṁkhyayoga, the Satkāraṇavāda of the Vedānta or similar other theories, by which the process of coming into being or rather 'conscious (i.e., known) existence' has been explained in the schools of Indian Philosophy.

II. Schools of Indian Philosophy

As already pointed out there exists a wide range of difference of opinion or theory among all speculative philosophers - many men of thought, and some of them are followed during their life-time or even later by other intellectuals who support or are guided by and contribute to,the development and spread of the particular theory of the first preceptor. Thus, we have what is called the 'schools of philosophy'. In India Nyāyavaiśesika, Sāmkhyayoga, Pūrvamīmāmsā and Uttaramīmāmsā or Vedānta clusters have been the well known main schools of philosophy. However, the apparent estrangements, oppositions and differences among schools are more marked and wide-ranging in the history of Indian thought than among ordinary thinkers or theorists individually at any one time.

The number of schools in Indian Philosophy is not limited to six as alleged sometimes, because, according to the Indian view point numerous individual thinkers or seers have had numerous darśanas[1] or visions of the

1. The full meaning and significance of the use of this term in Indian Thought is not completely suggested although often translated by using the nearest suitable and usual English equivalents

nature of Reality or Truth, each consistantly explanatory of the multitudinous diversity in the whole universe in its own respect, in all times and places.[1]

Nevertheless, the fundamental unity of aim among the various schools is clearly descernible to any sincere student of Indian Philosophy. Each system preaches a theory of reality but the darśana or intuitive perception or direct realisation of the tattva or Self or the Highest Truth, with or without any names, e.g. ātman, śiva, brāhman and puruṣa etcetera ascribed to its various phases or forms according to the different standpoints in the various schools, is the final aim of each school.

The different visions or phases of the unique reality have been propounded for the benefit of different kinds of inquirers after the highest knowledge or aim of life at their respectively various levels of the ascending road of truth or spiritual experience. This fact has been most clearly brought out in Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's meaningful and memorable lines as follows:

"na hi te munayo bhrāntāḥ sarvajñattvātteṣam kintu bahirviṣayapravaṇānām āpātataḥ paramapuruṣārthe praveśo na bhavatīti nāstikyavāraṇāya taiḥ prakārabhedāḥ pradarśitāḥ"

---

1. See under the head 'varieties of darśana' pp.4-8 of 'Conception of Matter' by Umesha Mishra, (Allahabad 1936), pp. 4-8

prakaraṇabhedāḥ pradarśitāḥ // [1].

Besides the unity of aim and the apparent difference in approach[2] as pointed out above the salient features of all the orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy include their common indebtedness to the Vedic background for their ultimate origin and inspiration, the belief that every change or happening in the phenomenal universe has known or unknown cause or causes, the common belief in the efficiency of the law or karman and the theory of rebirth, and the overwhelmingly practical need of ~~the~~ true knowledge for deliverance from miseries or the attainment of the fundamental real and eternal bliss.

III. The Orthodox and the Non-orthodox

Very often according to the Indian tradition and provisionally in the absence of sufficient chronological data, the different schools of Indian Philosophy have been divided into two groups viz., nāstika or non-orthodox

1. Prasthānabheda as quoted in Aspects of Indian Thought by Dr. G.N.Kaviraj, p.76.

2. त्रयी सांख्यं योगः पशुपतिमतं वैष्णवमिति प्रभिन्ने प्रस्थाने परमिदमदः पथ्यमिति च ।
रुचीनां वैचित्र्यादृजुकुटिलनानापथजुषां नृणामेको गम्यस्त्वमसि पयसामर्णव इव ॥
Puspadanta's Śivamahimnaḥstotram, Verse 7.

and āstika or orthodox. The former, moreover, is said to consist of three main divisions viz., the Cārvāka, the Buddha and the Jain Schools as well as the āgamas or tantras viz., the Śaiva and the Vaiṣṇava etc., while the latter mainly consists of the schools such as the Nyāyavaiśeṣika, Sāṁkhyayoga, Pūrvamīmāṁsā and Vedānta.

The only great difference between the two groups is that while the orthodox schools accept the authenticity of knowledge contained in the Veda, the non-orthodox schools do not rely on them, and, very often, even exclude such (Vedic) āgama pramāṇa from their categories of the means of right knowledge. Now, among the orthodox schools, while the pūrvamīmāṁsā alone depends entirely on the infallible words of the Veda all other schools are agreed on the fact, in case sensual perception or reasoning falls short of explaining a problem or experience, the verdict of the ancient Veda directly or to a lesser extent even of the literature, e.g., smṛti, itihāsa etcetera based on or developed from it during the later ages, is reliable. Thus, all orthodox schools have śabda or verbal testimony as one of the valid means of knowledge and thereby tend to realise the limits of sheer reason. Indeed, the

various orthodox seers have time and again emphasized that the highest knowledge is not obtainable through intellectual exercise alone[1]. Thus, even the so-called school of pure logic, or nyāya prescribes the role of tarka or reasoning as only for helping or substantiating the knowledge gained by other valid means[2].

IV. The Scheme adopted

Keeping in mind our limitations as detailed above we shall deal, first of all with the unsystematised stray ideas about creation as reflected in the Saṁhitās and the

---

1. नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया यां त्वमापः सत्यधृतिर्बतासि। Kathopaniṣad 1.2.9; तर्काप्रतिष्ठानात्। Vedāntasūtra 2.1.11. यत्नेनानुमितोऽप्यर्थः कुशलैरनुमातृभिः। अभियुक्ततरैरन्यैरन्यथैवोपपाद्यते॥ Vākyapadīya 1.34; श्रद्धावाँल्लभते ज्ञानम्। Bhagavadgītā 4.39.

2. तर्को न प्रमाणसंगृहीतो, न प्रमाणान्तरम्, प्रमाणानामनुग्राहकस्तत्त्वज्ञानाय कल्पते। Nyāyabhāṣya of Vātsyāyana 1.1.1; Cf. the concepts of श्रवण, मनन and निदिध्यासन or 'authoritative words or texts', 'reasoning' and last but not least 'direct realization' in orthodox Indian Philosophy as the gradual process of आत्मज्ञान or 'Knowing the reality'. आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यो मैत्रेय्यात्मनो वा अरे दर्शनेन श्रवणेन मत्या विज्ञानेनेदं सर्वं विदितम्।
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2.4.5.

Upanisadas which together are undoubtedly accepted by tradition as the historical background for the rise and spread of the later so-called schools of Indian Philosophy. Next, will come an analytical and independent review of the different theories of creation as propounded in the main orthodox schools of Indian one by one. In the end, we shall conclude our study by giving a synthetic and general approach towards the problem of creation as revealed through the orthodox Indian Philosophy as a whole.

CHAPTER - II

The Saṃhitās

I. Introduction

Since the very dawn of history man has tried to solve the problem as to how all the beings and the objects of the universe first came into being and what is their true nature. It is an undeniable fact that out of the very-few-indeed[1] literary records of earliest civilization Vedic Saṃhitas are regarded as one of the most important and ancient. Though the information regarding the Āryans' social and religious life is quite numerous, abstract philosophical discussions find only stray references in them. We do not find, hence, any fully developed, detailed and systematized theory of creation anywhere. Nevertheless, the seeds of or the earliest references to, the thoughts of later Vedic (and through them even the still later organised schools of Indian philosophy), can be found in the Saṃhitās themselves. This is why, a critical study of the Saṃhitās for finding ideas or theories of creation, howsoever simple, vague or fragmentary a picture they might present to the modern mind, is historically important.

---

1. Ṛgveda 1. 164. 4 and 5. Griffith's translation.

Indeed, such a study is amply fascinating and justifiably rewarding in its revelations. It shall be our endeavour in the course of this chapter to examine the main theory or theories of creation as found in them.

II. First Musings

At the earliest and the primary stage we come across only the first questions and attempts, the most primitive beginnings of natural philosophy and theories of creation. The poets in their ignorance search with their intellect the hidden traces of the invisible, unseen gods, for their origin and deeds:

> Who hath beheld at birth the Primal Being, seen
> How the boneless she supports the bony ?
> Where is the blood of earth, the life, the spirit ?
> Who may approach the man who knows, to ask it ?
> Unripe in mind, in spirit undiscerning, I ask of
> these the god's established places ;
> For up above the yearling calf the sages, to form
> a web, their own seven threads have woven[1] !

And again, we have in the lines:

> Ye will not find him who produced these creatures;
> another thing has risen up among you
> Enwrapt in misty cloud, with lips that stammer,
> Hymn-chanters wander and are discontented.[2]

---

1. Rgveda ~~10.82.7.~~ 1.164.4, and 5. Griffiths Tr.
2. Ibid 10.82.7

an evidence of human intellect mystified and groping in the dark unable to satisfy his curiosity and yet stammering hymns. Perhaps, the best and the most sensible as well as daring example of this spirit, of uncertainity and questioning is finally found in the famous 'Song of Creation' itself: "Who verily knows and who can here declare it, whence it was born and whence comes this creation ? The Gods are later than this world's production. Who knows then whence it first came into being ? He, the first origin of this creation, whether he formed it all or did not form it, whose eye controls this world in highest heaven, he verily knows it, or perhaps he knows not."[1] Such, indeed, is the ending note of one of the best pieces of writing found about the problem of creation in the Saṁhitās. Thus, simplicity and fairness of intellect is one of the most prevalent characteristics of the Vedic Ṛṣis and, for the same reason, their most advanced theories, too, apparently sometimes seem lacking in firm conviction, although they are at the same time representative of the purest quests of the human heart.

---

1. Ṛgveda 10.129.6 and 7.

III. The Mechanical[1] Theory

Creation of the universe has been metaphorically described in the form of the raising of a human building. For example, Indra, the Clever Workman,[2] is said to have sealed the six regions and formed the vast surface of earth and the dome of the sky.[2/] The act of spreading out the earth etc. which has been attributed to Agni,[3] Varuṇa,[4] Viṣṇu[5] etc. also, seems closely related to that of measuring. Having measured the three earthly regions Viṣṇu has solidly based his abode on a high pedestal.[6] The poles, the beams, the door-

---

1. The title for this section has been borrowed by me from Macdonell's <u>Vedic Mythology</u> pp.11-12.

2. Ṛgveda 4.56.3

2/. अयं षडुर्वीरमिमीत धीरो न याभ्यो भुवनं कच्चनारे ।।
अयं स यो वरिमाणं पृथिव्या वर्ष्माणं दिवो अकृणोदयं सः ।
अयं पीयूषं तिसृषु प्रवत्सु सोमो दाधारोर्व;न्तरिक्षं ।।

Ibid, 6.47.3-4.

3. Ibid. 1. 96. 4; ibid 7.5.7.

4. Ibid. 7.61.4; ibid 5.85.5

5. Ibid. 1.154. 1-2.

6. विष्णोर्नु कं वीर्याणि प्रवोचं यः पार्थिवानि विममे रजांसि ।
यो अस्कभायदुत्तरं सधस्थं विचक्रमाणस्त्रेधोरुगायः ।।
Ibid.1.154.1.

corners, the doors, the mechanical instruments, the pegs etc.[1] have found significant mention to make this type of image of the created universe as a building complete. This theory in fact recognises the hands of Savitṛ, Bṛhaspati, Indra, Varuṇa, Vāyu and Pitṛ as co-creators of or at least helpers of Viṣṇu or Indra as the case may be, in the act of creation.[2]

That the heavens and the earth could be formed out of wood by the devas (shining ones)[3] is also conjectured. The question has been posed as to which wood and that of what kind of tree if at all was used for the manufacture or creation of the dyāvāpṛthivī (heaven and earth).[4] Later Vedic literature probably tried to answer this question by maintaining Brahman (the Universal Spirit)

---

1. e.g., see Ṛgveda 10.149.1; 3.38.3; 5.85.5; 1.56.5; 4.50.1; 7.99.3 etc. for the Savitṛ, Pitṛ, Varuṇa, Vāyu, Bṛhaspati and Indra.

2. It is to be carefully noted that exactly this kind of polytheism in the act of creation is not entirely accepted by any one of the main orthodox or ever heterodox schools of Indian Philosophy, although common beliefs (cf. the myths of Vāmana and Viśvakarman for example) continue to be largely inspired by this pure polytheism even now in the Indian Society.

3. Ṛgveda 10.31.7; ibid 10.81.4.

as both the material and efficient cause of creation.[1] The concept of Puruṣa in human form as the material cause * is worth recalling here. There, too, the idea of gods as the efficient cause of creation can[2] be favourably compared to this theory and we may thus link it as an intermediate stage of development between the mechanical theory and the answer given in the later age of the Brāhmaṇas.

The division of types of causes into the samavāyi (material) and the nimitta (efficient) necessary in a produce or effect was later admirably exploited by the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika schools of Indian Philosophy. The principle that the universe is composed of both cetana (conscious) and jaḍa (inert) energies or matter seems to be in the background in this theory. It affords an admirable example of how abstract problems of philosophy are explained away in the garb of ordinary human experience, here that of building a house. Just as the gods were

---

1. ब्रह्म वनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीत् etc. (meaning that ब्रह्म was the forest, ब्रह्म was that tree from which they fashioned heaven and earth ....) Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 2.8.9.6.

2. Ṛgveda 10.90

modelled on human personality, so were the cosmic actions of the gods supposed to be only 'magnified copies of human action.[1] Hence the image of the building of a house by different men in the context of 'creation' is understandably noteworthy.

The purpose of creation is not always mentioned though sometimes the dyaus, the antariksa, the Prthivi, the Usas, the Parvatas, the sarits and the osadhis or vanaspatayah, the soma or the parjanya etc. are intended for the good of men or jivas in general, for their well-being and happiness.[2]

IV. Theory of 'One' Creator

According to the western scholars originally the Vedic people believed in polytheism and in the existence of many gods or powers which inhabit the various forces of nature thus explaining the diverse and mysterious happenings and ways of Nature. Next came the imagination

---

1. Wallis, Cosmology in the Rgveda, pp.27
2. Rgveda 6.49.13; 6.69.5; 1.155.4.

of monotheism and a chief or Lord of gods was accepted.[1] Lastly was developed their belief in the doctrine of pantheism which is evidenced in the latest hymns of the Saṁhitā such as the puruṣa sūkta.[2]

This view, however, sounds superficial and unimpressively forced when we consider the contents of the Vedic literature and their oriental interpretations in this connection as follows. The above doctrine is also revealed in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka[3] where it is said that devotees belonging to the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda, and the Sāmaveda respectively worship the same Supreme Existence in the form of uktha, agni and mahāvrata. Thus, Yāska clearly interprets the nature of Vedic gods in daivatakāṇḍa:

> mahābhāgyāt, devatāyā eka eva ātmā bahudhā stūyate/
> ekasyātmanònye devāḥ pratyaṁgāni bhavanti //
> (Nirukta 7.4.8.9).

---

1. Macdonnel's History of Samskrit Literature pp.116-118; Also the Six systems of Indian Philosophy by Max Müller printed Chowkhambha Samskrit Studies Vol.XVI pp.39-41.
2. Cf.Ṛgveda 10.90
3. एतं ह्येव बह्वृचा महत्युक्थे मीमांसन्त एतमग्नावध्वर्यव एतं महाव्रते छन्दोगाः ।

   Taittirīya Āraṇyaka 3.2.3.12

The gods are, thus, undoubtedly symbols of diverse powers of only 'one' god. This theme of the One Reality is supported by Bṛhaddevatā.[1] They are called innumerable, lasting and vast. Thus, we can say that the greatest purpose of Ṛgveda is to describe Brahman or One transcendent and universal being which as cause manifests into so many realities of the finite world. That the difference in the various names of gods occuring in the polytheistic 'theory' (or vision at a particular stage) of the phenomenon of creation is not real in the ultimate analysis will be evident to any reader having even a nodding acquaintance with the Saṁhitās. Again, the Ṛgveda ~~mx~~ says that prayers addressed to the various gods are in reality prayers addressed to Indra.[2] The all-pervasiveness and oneness of divinity or existence is also reflected in the Vedic concepts of puruṣa,[3] aditi, Skambha, and ucchiṣṭa etc. We shall later on

---

1. Bṛhaddevatā 1.61-65.
2. Ṛgveda 1.7; Cf. यो यो यां यां तनुं भक्तः श्रद्धयार्चितुमिच्छति। तस्य- तस्याचलां श्रद्धां तामेव विदधाम्यहम् ।।

   Bhagwadgītā 7.21.
3. See the following section on 'The Sacrificial Theory' (vide p. 26).

deal with the all-immanent and transcedent description of puruṣa. Thus, it is also said that aditi is ether, mid-rigion, mother, father and son, all the gods, the five primeval clans, the born and the yet-to-be-born.[1] Similarly, the skambha (or basis) which is another name for jyeṣṭha brahman or Transcendent Reality, is said to be at the root of all existence,[2] of present past and future,[3] and is even identified with Ātman or the soul - the essence itself which is immortal and ever young.[4]

The devotees of the saṃhitā have a clear idea of one universal being, without a second who (eko viśvasya bhuvanasya rājā sa yodhāya ca kṣayāya ca janān) is the only ruler of the universe, who destroys the wicked

---

1. अदितिर्द्यौरदितिरन्तरिक्षमदितिर्माता स पिता स पुत्रः ।
विश्वे देवा अदितिः पञ्च जना अदितिर्जातमदितिर्जनित्वम् ॥

Ṛgveda 1.89.10

2. Atharvaveda 10.7.12; 10.7.35.

3. Ibid. 10.8.1.

4. अकामो धीरो अमृतः स्वयम्भूः .... धीरमजरं
युवानम् ॥
Atharvaveda 10.8.44.

enemies and protects the good.[1] Similarly, it is said that, Indra with his powers (māyābhiḥ) assumes various forms.[2] Indra, the One Great God, appears to us in the forms of the āditya, the nakṣatras, the agni and the vāyu.[3] Gods have been addressed in Ṛgveda as asura.[4] Their asuratva or great might or power has been recognised as one and the same.[5] As various manifest forms of the one Supreme Power or Force which sustains them, their (god's) powers or activities are not independent.[6]

---

1. Ṛgveda 3.46.2.; Cf Bhagawadgitā 4.8.
2. Ibid 6.47.18; Cf the famous doctrine वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad.
3. Ibid 1.6.3; 1.6.1 (together with Sāyaṇa's commentary on it).
4. तद्देवस्य सवितुः... असुरस्य प्रचेतसः Ṛgveda 4.53.1; असुर here stands for God's śakti or power: 'तदिदं देवानां एकं मुख्यं असुरत्वम्। अस्यति क्षिपति सर्वानित्यसुरः प्रबलः तस्य भावोऽसुरत्वम् प्राबल्यम्। महदैश्वर्यम्॥' Cf. Ibid 3.55.1 with Sāyaṇabhāṣya.
5. Cf. the line महद् देवानामसुरत्वमेकम् at the end of each Ṛk in Ṛgveda 3.55.
6. Ibid.

In this way, the Saṁhitās clearly seem to establish the absolute - monistic (advaitic) theory of creation when it says that the all-doer (viśvakarman), the supreme and mighty lord (parameśvara) merged within Himself the entire creation (during the cyclic process of dissolution after the former creation) and remained "alone" (before creation), and again, for the good of the people (the jīvas), He concealed His own natural (absolute monistic) form while manifesting Himself into so many created beings.[1] Thus, the Supreme Self[2] - apart from which nothing exists[3] - has been described as the Highest Resort,[4] the Highest Heaven,[5] the Fearless sight[6] etc. The above idea of the Universality

---

1. Ṛgveda 10.81.1.
2. The attainment of the knowledge of this paramātman has been emphasized throughout the Vedic Literature. - 'तमेव विदित्वातिमृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय' Cf. Atharvaveda 31.18 and 31.21; Ṛgveda 1.25.11. This very line of thought later developed into 'एकेन विज्ञानेन सर्वं विज्ञातं भवति' doctrine of Bṛhadāraṇyaka.
3. एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति, etc. Ṛgveda 1.164.46.
4. Ibid. 1.22.20; 1.22.21.
5. Ibid. 1.143.2.
6. Ibid. 2. 27. 11.

or oneness of Cosmic Energy (tejas) of Existence (sat) is most beautifully reflected in the monologuic narrations of their experiences and existences by the Ṛṣis Vāmadeva[1] and Vagāmbhṛṇī.[2]

V. The Sacrificial Theory

The description of the creation of the Universe from one transcendent and immanent God (puruṣa)[3] as found in the puruṣasūkta[4] affords a 'what-may-be-termed-as' sacrificial theory of creation in the perfect allegorical setting of a puruṣamedha yāga[5] identified

1. Ṛgveda 4.26.1-3.
2. Ibid. 10.125.
3. सहस्रशीर्षा पुरुषः सहस्राक्षः सहस्रपात्। स भूमिं विश्वतो वृत्वात्यतिष्ठद् दशाङ्गुलम्॥ पुरुष एवेदं सर्वं यद्भूतं यच्च भव्यम्। उतामृतत्वस्येशानो यदन्नेनातिरोहति॥ एतावानस्य महिमाऽतो ज्यायांश्च पूरुषः। पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि॥

   Ṛgveda 10.90. 1-3; Cf. Śvetāśvatara 3.16.
4. सोऽयं सर्ववेदान्तवेद्यः परमात्मा स्वयमेव स्वकीयया मायया विराड्देहं ब्रह्माण्डरूपं सृष्ट्वा तत्र जीवरूपेण प्रविश्य ब्रह्माण्डाभिमानी देवतात्मा जीवोऽभवत्। Sāyaṇa's commentary on Ṛgveda 10.90. The same hymn appears with little textual differences in Śuklayajurveda Saṁhitā 19.6
5. Creator was in the later Brāhmaṇa age identified with the sacrifice or yajña itself due to the growing importance of ritual performances among the populace. Hence, this Puruṣa became known as yajña and even the paśu of the puruṣamedha legend.

With Prajāpati or Virāṭ, the Sole Creator, Himself.[1]

The theme of the sūkta runs as follows:

The One puruṣa (the Parbrahman or Ādipuruṣa),[2]

---

1. अथयस्मात् पुरुषमेधो नामेमे वै लोकाः पूरयमेव पुरुषो योऽयं पवते सोऽस्यां पुरि शेते तस्मात् पुरुषः। तस्य यदेषु लोकेष्वन्नं तदस्यान्नं मेधस्तदस्यैतदन्नं मेधस्तस्मात् पुरुषमेधः।

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13.6.2.1; Cf. Uvaṭa's commentary:
पुरमात्मज्ञानानन्दादिगुणप्रयात्मनि प्रभृतः पुरुषमेधो यज्ञः प्रजापतिः लोकत्रिकालाग्न्यादिमयः पुरुषोत्पत्तिस्थितिसंहृतीनां हेतुः — स्वर्गापवर्गमोक्षदो ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयकारणं शरीरं, यज्ञो वा अस्यात्मा भवतीति श्रुतिः।
on Ṛgveda 10.90.1.

2. Cf. the opening lines of Sāyaṇa's commentary on the puruṣasūkta: . . . .
.. अव्यक्तमहदादिविलक्षणश्चेतनो यः पुरुषः 'पुरुषान्न परं किंचित्' (कठोपनिषद् 3/11) इत्यादिश्रुतिषु प्रसिद्धः स [illegible]

and also the same on Ṛgveda 10.90.4:
योऽयं पुरुषः संसाररहितो ब्रह्मस्वरूपः ... तस्यास्य पादो लेशः सोऽयं पुनः इह मायायां पुनरभवत्। सृष्टिसंहाराभ्यां पुनरागच्छति।

threefourth part[1] of which significantly remains unmanifest in a creation symbolising thereby the anupahita or unqualified Reality as the real and permanent nature of all existence,[2] out of a small portion[3] of His own Self,[4] created[5] the great[6] vīrāja[7]

---

1. त्रिपादूर्ध्वमुदैत् पुरुषः पादोऽस्येहाभवत् पुनः ।
   Rgveda 10.90.4 and
   पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि
   Rgveda 10.90.3. The Rgveda also repeats the same essential idea when only onefourth is said to manifest as ereation of Ibid.1.154.4.

2. The Vedic Rsi does not seem to lose sight of the essential nature of all reality even when describing the myriad manifestations of Puruṣa.

3. In fact this is only a way of saying, for Virāj is not substantially different from Ādipuruṣa. The epithet विराट् (Great), however, fits in with the image of the cosmos or ब्रह्माण्ड as puruṣa as has been conceived here.

4. त्रिपादूर्ध्वमुदैत्पुरुषः पादोऽस्येहाभवत् पुनः ।
   Rgveda 10.90.4. Cf. What Lord himself says:
   विष्टभ्याहमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांशेन स्थितो जगत् ।
   in Gītā 10.42.

5. तस्माद्विराळजायत विराजो अधिपूरुषः ।
   Rgveda 10.90.5.

6. सहस्रशीर्षा पुरुषः सहस्राक्षः सहस्रपात् ।
   स भूमिं स्पृत्वात्यतिष्ठद्दशांगुलम् ।।
   Rgveda 10.90.1.

7. Ibid. सर्वप्राणिसमष्टिरूपो ब्रह्माण्डदेहो विराडाख्यो यः
   पुरुषः सोऽयं
   etc. of Sāyaṇa's Commentary on it; Rgveda 1.154.

puruṣa who again is said to have created the bhūmi or brahmāṇḍaloka[1] (the universe) as well as pervaded it,[2] and even transcended it.[3] All that grow on food or otherwise, i.e. the animate and the inanimate objects of the universe[4] are His creation and He alone manifests himself through these and all the same remains eternal.[5] He created these even in the past and

---

1. ~~Ibid.~~ Ṛgveda 10.90
2. Ibid, विश्वतश्चक्षुरुत विश्वतो मुखो विश्वतो बाहुरुत विश्वतस्पात्।
   सं बाहुभ्यां धमति संपतत्रैर्द्यावाभूमी जनयन्देव एकः ।।
   ~~Ṛgveda 10.81.3. cf. 8~~
   Ṛgveda 10.81.3; Cf. Śuklayajurvedasaṁhitā 17.119 and Śvetāśvataropaniṣat 3.16.
3. एतावानस्य महिमातो ज्यायांश्च पूरुषः ।
   पादोऽस्य विश्वाभूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि ।।
   Ṛgveda 10.90.3; Cf.
   यस्य त्री पूर्णा मधुना पदान्यक्षीयमाणा स्वधया मदन्ति।
   य उ त्रिधातु पृथिवीमुत द्यामेको दाधार भुवनानि विश्वा।।
   Ṛgveda 1.154.4
4. ततो विष्वङ् व्यक्रामत् साशनानशने अभि॥ Ṛgveda 10.90.4; Cf.
   ततो मायायामागत्यानन्तरं विष्वङ् देवमनुष्यतिर्यगादिरूपेण विविधः सन् व्यक्रामत् व्याप्तवान्। किं कृत्वा साशनानशने अभिलक्ष्य साशनं भोजनादिव्यवहारोपेतं चेतनं प्राणिजातम्। अनशनं तद्रहितमचेतनं गिरिनद्यादिकम्। Sāyaṇa's commentary on the above.
5. पुरुष एवेदं सर्वं यद्भूतं यच्च भाव्यम्। उतामृतत्वस्येशानो यदन्नेनातिरोहति ॥ Ṛgveda 10.90.2.

shall create them even in the future whenever creation takes place.[1] This virāj, the Universal Energy of Creative Force of Ādipuruṣa,[2] thus creates the physical elements viz. earth etc. the lokas viz., the various regions of the universe and puraḥ, i.e., the four types of organic bodies.[3] Here ends the puruṣasṛṣṭi portion of the hymn according to Sāyaṇa.[4]

This theory lends itself to a literary or allegorical interpretation of creation in which the puruṣa or the

---

1. Ibid; cyclic process of the creation, existence and extinction viz. sṛṣṭi, sthiti and pralaya respectively has been alluded to in this [illegible].

2. Cf. Sāyaṇa's commentary on Ṛgveda 10.90.5

3. तस्मादेव पुरुषाद् विश्वोत्पत्तिः । तत्र पूर्वं विराड् अजायत । विराजोऽधिपुरुषः प्रधानं तेजः । स क्षेत्रज्ञो ब्रह्मा सृष्टिकृत् जातः स अत्यरिच्यत । पश्चात् अस्मात् क्षेत्रज्ञाद् ब्रह्मणो भूमिः [illegible] जाता उत्पन्ना इति अर्थान्तरं पुरः शरीराणि पुराणि चतुर्विधानि भूतान्यजायन्त । पुराणीति तेनैवोत्पादितानि । एवमेकोंऽशः, तेनैव सर्वं विश्वमुत्पादितमिति ।

Uvaṭa's Commentary on Ṛgveda 10.90.5.

4. यथा पूर्वोक्तक्रमेणैव शरीरे पुरुषं [illegible] उत्तरसृष्टिरित्यर्थः

etc. Sāyaṇa's Commentary on 10.90.6.

'physical' human form is said to be born from virāj (cf. virājo adhipuruṣaḥ) and having been sacrificed by the sāndhiya devas and ṛṣis[1] effects the whole creation. In this all-consuming[2] sacrifice the oblation to be offered in the form of Haviṣ[3] or yajñapaśu,[4] the sacrifice itself,[5] and the yajamāna devas etc.[6] are all the puruṣa Himself before creation.[7] Again, the devas are said to imagine the puruṣa as Haviṣ etc. and then perform the sacrifice as a mānasayajña[8] (conceptual sacrifice). For, the actual sacrifice

---

1. Sāyaṇa's commentary on Ṛgveda 10.90.7.
2. सर्वहुतः । Ṛgveda 10.90.9
3. Ibid 10.90.16
4. Cf. the famous orthodox saying न हि पशुभिर्विना यज्ञः प्रकल्प्येत or यज्ञार्थं पशवः सृष्टाः
5. Ṛgveda 10.90.16.
6. Sāyaṇa's commentary on Ibid.
7. cf. the commentaries of Sāyaṇa and Mahīdhara on Ṛgveda 10.90.7.
8. Commentaries of Sāyaṇa and Mahīdhara on Ṛgveda 10.90.16.

in its crudest and grossest form cannot be said to have been practically and physically performed. This will be clear when we pay attention to the following detailed hyperbolic enumerations in the sūkta. "When Gods prepared the sacrifice with puruṣa as their offering, Its oil was spring, the holy gift was autumn, summer was the wood. They balmed as victim on the grass puruṣa born in earliest time. With him the Dieties and all Sādhyas and Ṛṣis sacrificed. From that great general sacrifice the dripping fat was gathered up. He formed the creatures of the air, and animals both wild and tame. From that general sacrifice Ṛks and Sāma hymns were born. Therefrom were spells and charms produced, the Yajuṣ had its birth from it. From it were horses born, from it all cattle with two row of teeth; From it were generated kine, from it the goats and sheep were born. When they divided puruṣa how many portions did they make ? What do they call his mouth, his arms ? What do they call his thighs and feet ?

The Brāhmaṇa was his mouth, of both his arms was the Rājanya made. His thighs became the Vaiśya, from his feet the Śūdra was produced. The moon was gendered from his mind, and from his eye the sun had birth; Indra and

and Agni from his mouth were born, and Vāyu from his breath. Forth from his navel came mid-air; the sky was fashioned from his head; Earth from his feet, and from his ear the regions. Thus they formed the worlds. Seven fencing sticks had he, thrice seven layers of fuel were prepared, when the Gods, offering sacrifice, bound, as their victim Puruṣa. Gods sacrificing, sacrificed the victim; these were the earliest holy ordinances. The Mighty ones attained the height of heaven, there were the Sādhyas, Gods of Old, dwelling.[1]

It is important to note here that the whole creation has been presented as a microcrasm, the ultimate reality being compared to a huge Cosmic Person. The later concept of the force of Divine Will (saṁkalpa)[2]

---

1. From Griffith's translation of the Ṛgveda.10.90.

2. यत्पुरुषं व्यदधुः कतिधा व्यकल्पयत्

Ṛgveda 10.90.10.; Ibid 10.90.15;

देवा उत्तरसृष्टयर्थं बाह्यद्रव्यस्यानुत्पन्नत्वेन हविरन्तरासम्भवात् पुरुषस्वरूपमेव मन[illegible] हविष्ट्वेन संकल्प्य पुरुषेण पुरुषाख्येन हविषा मानसं यज्ञमतन्वतान्वतिष्ठन्॥

Sāyaṇa's commentary on Ṛgveda 10.90.6

in some form should be accepted as a real clue in this apparently sacrificial theory of creation. In fact Saṁkalpa or psychological activity of creation precedes physical creation. The anthromorphistic imagination of the Universal Principle (Puruṣa) though crudely allegorized does not prevent us from tracing creation from the One Absolute as described above, for the supreme reality itself becomes the brahmāṇḍadeha (Cosmos-bodied) Virāṭ Puruṣa.

VI. The Tejas Theory

In various passages of the Saṁhitās, of whom Ṛgveda appears not only as the most ancient but important as well, the Sun is glorified as the Hiraṇyagarbha 'golden-embrio', and has also been addressed as Prajāpati.[1] Savitṛ again is described as the ruler[2] and the soul[3] of all that moves and stands. He is regarded as responsible for generation or creation.[4] Sun or Sūrya is also identified

1. Ṛgveda 4.53.2. It is to be particularly noted that creator becomes most well-known by the name of Prajāpati alone in the Brāhmaṇas.
2. Ibid 4.53.6
3. Ibid 1.115.1
4. Macdonell, A.A., Vedic Mythology p.12

with a form of agni (or tejas) as the blazing and the shining element of that name.[1] It may be remarked that agni represents Energy or tejas element and as such has been associated with all the devas in the Saṃhitās. His (agni's) extraordinary familiarity, brilliance and vitality undoubtedly made of him a real symbol of the supreme (or even immortal) Conscious (or even cosmic) Energy in the Upaniṣads. The notion of chemical action, (pākaviśeṣa) in Taittirīya Āraṇyaka 1.2 which becomes so developed in the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika systems later on, also shows its (agni's) ability to shape new things, even as he does so sitting on the primeval substance (mostly water). As such the Sun too (i.e. as a representative of agni or tejas) has been eulogised as to have enlightened and alone become all this (the whole of the created universe). This very element or creative form (agni, sūrya or prajāpati as mentioned above) is variously called by different names e.g. Indra, Mitra,

---

1. Ṛgveda 10.121.3 where Savitṛ has, thus, been prayed as the Lord of the Universe by being identified with Hiraṇyagarbha.

Varuṇa, Suparṇa and Mātariśvan. It is said that the creator, by whatsoever name we may call him, is but one reality.[1] So the hymns addressed to Prajāpati, to Savitṛ, to Hiraṇyagarbha, to Agni, to Varuṇa or others as 'creators' should not confuse us as to the unitary and uniform character of the Creator God. Let us, however, for the sake of convenience identify that one as "golden-embrio" or Hiraṇyagarbha.[2] Even the word 'Brahman' is used for Creator in the Atharvaveda[3] later on.

According to the Hiraṇyagarbha Prājāpatya hymn:[4]

"In the beginning arose Hiraṇyagarbha, born Only Lord of all created beings. He fixed and holdeth up this

---

1. Ṛgveda 1.164.46; 10.114.5; Bālakhilya 10.2
2. This epithet, curiously enough, can suggest its suitability to both Sūrya and agni.
3. ब्रह्मेदमूर्ध्वं तिर्यक् चान्तरिक्षं व्यचो हितम्।

   Atharvaveda 10.2.25.
4. Ṛgveda 10.121.

eath and heaven ....Giver of vital breath, of power and vigour, he whose commandments all the gods acknowledge: The Lord of death, whose shade is life immortal ....Who by his grandeur hath become Sole Ruler of all the moving world that breathes and slumbers; He who is Lord of Men and Lord of Cattle..... His, through his might, are these snowcovered mountains, and men call sea and Rasā his possession: His arms are these, his are these heavenly regions........By him the heavens are strong and earth is stead-fast, by him light's realm and sky-vault are supported: By him the regions in mid-air were measured.........To him supported by his help, two armies embattled look while trembling in their spirit, when over them the risen Sun is shining.....What time the mighty waters came, containing the universal germ, producing Agni, Thence sprang the Gods' one spirit into being....He, in his might, surveyed the floods containing productive force and generating Worship.[1] He is the God of the

---

1. The term यश rather stands for sacrifice or penance (cf. the prevalent idea of the Upanisads that the creator had to perform तपस् equatable to something like 'motivated exertion'). cf. expression like सः तपोऽतप्त प्रजायेयेति in this connection.

gods, and none beside him.........Ne'er may he harm us who is the earth's Begetter, nor he whose laws are sure, the heaven's Creator, He who brought forth the great and lucid waters.......Prajāpati ! thou only comprehendest all these created things, and none beside thee. Grant us our hearts desire when we invoke thee; may we have store of riches in possession." [1]

We can deduce the following important ideas concerning creation from this hymn. First, before creation there exist primeval waters (āpaḥ) which has the seed of creation in it (bṛhatīḥ garbhamādadhānā) in the form of creative force (dakṣaṁ) which can primarily be conceived as tejas or cit alone. Second, those very waters containing the aforesaid garbha[2] produces agni or fire (for, has not fire in its purest form been maintained throughout Indian Philosophy as a form

---

1. From Griffith's Translation.

2. It is remarkable that the fact of dualism, viz., it takes at least two to create) is recognised here, otherwise waters alone could have been mentioned as all-creating.

or even the very embodiment of it or Supreme Conscious Energy). After this only, prajāpati (or agni identified as Creator in this hymn) the Creator, possessed of strength, vitality or energy[1] creates earth (janitā Yaḥ Pṛthivya) and the ākāśa (divam Jajāna), the famous three regions of dayus, pṛthivī and nākaḥ[2] and the living beings,[3] the mountains, the oceans etc.[4] In this way the same energy or tejas, i.e., agni or prajāpati produces the rest of the physical elements at the time of creation. Again, all these elements dissolve in the same manner at last even in the primeval waters (which are never without tejas or its substitute). Likewise the souls or imperial selfs of men, gods, birds, beasts etc. (asuḥ) also come to exist from the

1. Cf. the words महित्वा in the 2nd, अवसा in the 6th and महिना in the 8th Ṛks of this hymn.
2. Ṛgveda 10.121.5
3. Ibid 10.121.3
4. Ibid 10.121.4.

same source, viz., Tejas or Hiraṇyagarbha.[1]

One may now in this context ask why not āpaḥ or waters be accepted as the sole element or principle responsible for the generation of the Universe ?[2] Our answer should be that the water and the fire both together generate or create the universe[3] - the five physical elements and in a graded way the later 'sub-creations' of the mountains, the vast spaces (or lokas), the organic bodies of living beings,[4] and the inanimate objects etc. found in the Universe. In respect to a further possible doubt as to which one of these two is more or less solely responsible (may be, in order of priority) for the phenomena of creation and as such deserves the repeatedly occurring epithet of "kasmai devāya haviṣā vidhema", and the description of "Hiraṇyagarbhaḥ samavartatāgre" as well as "bhūtasya jātaḥ patireka āsīt" in this first Ṛk, it should be understood that Tejas and not āpaḥ

1. Ibid 10.121.7 - 8; 10.82.5-6; cf. Sāyaṇas commentary on 10.90.5.

2. Ibid, 10.82.6

3. See the contrast between this and the trivṛtkaraṇa of Chāndogya Upaniṣad later on.

4. Ṛgveda 10.82

is the creator of the whole Universe, the later may even be eliminated if necessary.[1] (The passages in the later Vedic period like "āpo vai prathamaṁ sasarja" for example, are clearly expressive of the predominance of tejas(conscious energy) as Creator). For example, even in this hymn Hiraṇyagarbha (i.e. out tejas) is said to have created the ever growing (or evolving[2]) waters- Yaścāpaścandrā bṛhatīrjajāna.[3] Again, Tejas appears as cetana and therefore can move and participate (freely) in the act of creation, while āpaḥ, though evolving (bṛhatīḥ)[4] are at their best jada (inert), needing the garbha (tejorūpa vīrya or retas) [5] to motivate it. But as the Creator can only be a conscious

---

1. The passages in later Vedic period like आपो वै प्रथमं ससर्ज (पृ० 62), for example, are clearly expressive of the predominance of tejas (conscious energy) as creator in Vedic thought.
2. Cf. the concept of प्रकृति as कर्तृ in Sāṁkhya school later on.
3. Ṛgveda 10.121.9; cf. also 10.80.1 and 3.38.5 where Indra is said to create āpaḥ in the beginning.
4. Ṛgveda 10.121.4.
5. Retas and Āpaḥ may respectively be compared to scientific concepts of kinetic and potential forms of energies, though on a very small scale. Cf. Āpaḥ are also called retodhā and the fact that Garbha (representing vīrya or retas) is sustained by mātā and provided by the pitā even in human regeneration. Note how this very idea strikingly seems

energy the inert waters too are maintained as created by it. Thus, the twofold tejas or agni, before creation, has been called tirohita and the same when manifest in creation has been addressed as purohita. Hence, it may be said that most probably the theory ends in the favourite note of Vedic Monism.

VII. Non - being Theory

In a particular cosmogonic hymn of the Saṁhitā it is stated that the Existent sprang from the Non-Existent - asataḥ sadajāyata.[1] Here Brahmaṇaspati is said to have forged this world like a smith, with blast and smelting - brahmaṇaspatiretā saṁ Karmāra ivādhamat; the line is quite unconnected with the main theory of creation being advanced here and as such

---

to have originally suggested the Sāṁkhya concept of Prakṛti evolving by the mere sannidhi (proximity) of cetana puruṣa or conscious energy. Nevertheless it must be admitted that there the puruṣa plays rather a passive role and dualism (or even pluralism) is the final thesis of their concept and not monotheism.

1. Ṛgveda 10.72. Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2.1-2.

may be labelled by us as just a passing remark of the seer. Then, the hymn twice repeats its original contribution to the theory of creation from the nonexistent ('devānām pūrvye yoge asataḥ sadajāyata' and again 'devānām yuge prathame asataḥ sadajāyata').[1] This puts before us in unmistakable terms that the existent is born from the non-existent. Subsequently were born the Uttānapāda (ākāśa or sky)[2], the Bhūḥ (earth), āśāḥ (regions' or quarters of the horizon),[3] the Aditiḥ (the famous legendary mother of gods) and the aṣṭau devāḥ (the gods including the mārtaṇḍa) each after the immediately preceding existence or creation. Sun [4] is in a mysterious way described as being left for further generation (prajāyai) and extinction (mṛtyave) of the bhuvanas (i.e. the universe and its objects) - "the created ones"[5] which are, the seer submits, caused to grow (apinvata) by the gods (devas) like 'Yatayaḥ' (equivalent to those who exert, do penance or sacrifice for the

---

1. Ṛgveda 10.72; Cf. Atharvaveda 10.2.28

2. Cf. Wallis, who renders 'uttānapada' by the vegetter (sky); and Griffith does it by 'Productive Power.'

3. As interpreted by Griffith and Wilson respectively. There is, however, very little difference between the two.

4. Macdonell (Vedic Mythology p.12) and Wallis (Cosmology of the Ṛgveda Ch.II) also think that in the cosmological speculation of the Ṛgveda the sun was regarded as an important agent of generation.

5. Cf. the √ भू meaning that which becomes or comes

common good. In this way, first the creation, then the birth of the gods and at last the coming into being of the sun have been described here in the peculiar Vedic fashion.

It was generally believed that nothing could exist without being created first. Hence Sat means that which exists and Asat that which does not. Thus, the proper explanation of 'asataḥ sadajāyata' would be that which exists (after creations) came to exist after (or from) that which did not have ('that later') existence. Accordingly, while repudiating śunyavāda śaṁkara has interpreted asat as asadiva[1]. In that case, then, the śruti asataḥ sadajāyata may be taken as a precursor of the later satkāryavāda of the sāṁkhyayoga school.

Another notable point that deserves our attention in this hymn is the fact that towards the end Sūrya[2] (i.e. as the representative of generative and extinctive forces which we have discussed above) is left as the only possible 'god' (or existence) known to ordinary human mind capable

---

to exist and the significant use of the term bhuvanam here.

1. Śāṁkarabhāṣya 2.1.17.

2. Ṛgveda 10.211.6; Yajurveda 4.53.2, and 4.53.6.

of being viewed as a Creator. The peculiar relationship of Sūrya or Savitṛ to the other prominent gods of the Vedic pantheon is predominently reflected in the manner in which the common features of all the gods are emphasized time and again. These common features may be taken to be dyotamānatva (to shine and to enlighten), prerakatva or prasavitṛtva (to move, force or urge to activity), gatimattva (to stir or move) and last but not the least cetanavattva (consciousness). All these may be suggested by using the word tejas alone which is symbolic for Conscious Energy and should we not, perhaps, praise the great wisdom of the Vedic Ṛṣis when we cannot even today find a better agency than this kind of tejastva for being called a Creator ?

VIII. The Order (Ṛta) of Creation

Thus the creation of the universe has been traced at one place[1] from tapas[2] (warmth or fervour) from

1 . Ṛgveda 10.190

2. Creative Energy or the later concept of तपस् i.e. devotional ardour of asceticism of the Creator or Brahman (vide Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad recurring lines

which originated Ṛta (Eternal Law of Cosmic arrangement and harmony moral-order) as well as Satyaṁ (Truth). Ṛta signifies here the basic principle or background of all creation or a sort of moral order under which all phenomena in the universe are related as cause and effect, action and its fruit. Truth denotes the phase of physical evolution simultaneously getting manifested with the above Ṛta, or the psychic activity in the process of creation, of the Creator (dhātā). Then Rātri (night) was born and from it the billowy flood of sea (samudroarṇavaḥ). From the sea (or waters) the saṁvatsara[1] (the Year or the cycle of created existence)[2] was born, about whom it is said:

"ahorātrāṇi vidadhadviśvasya miṣato vaśi," that it created or ordained the days and nights thereby

---

like 'स तपोऽतप्यत,' सोऽकामयत एकोऽहं बहु स्याम etc. in the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads alike)

1. Cf. Sāyaṇas commentary on Ṛgveda 10.190 and also ततः संवत्सरे पुरुषः समभवत् स प्रजापतिः । Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 11.1.62.

2. Cf. the concept of sthiti following sṛṣṭi in Indian Philosophy.

acting as a Lord Controller of those 'that close the eyes' (i.e. all the living beings). It seems the functioning of the creations and their timings are entirely under his supervision, for, we are next told that the same Creator formed (akalpayat)[1] the sun and the moon (sūryācandramasau) the heaven (dyum), the earthly region (prithivī), the region of the air (antarikṣa) and the jyotirloka (svaḥ).[2]

From the nature and the description of the above hymn there remains no doubt about its cosmological contents. First, the order of creation has been described. The use of the word ajāyata in this context is quite a significant pointer to this conspicuous fact. True, the prefix adhi and the use of

---

1. Compare this with the term यज्ञमयजन्त of puruṣasūkta (Ṛgveda 10.90), and it is clear that then the creation by 'gods' is of a different kind based on यज् + [illegible] (i.e. Divine or motivated powerful Will). In fact, the creation of virāṭ puruṣa and again by virāṭ of the gods and everything else have already been effected, and, the gods are merely performing a mānasayajña.

2. Svaḥ is also one of the seven regions (Cf. f.n. 112 below) of the Universe as conceived by the Aryan geographers.

apādāna in arṇavat etc. hint at the priority of the creation or production of satya etc. in comparison to those mentioned after them (Cf. the oft-used term tataḥ). No more is communicated to us.

In the lines that follow next, we have a concrete figure of a dhātā, the Creator, and His act of creation (cf. the use of altogether different words 'akalpayat' and vidadhat' in this context). The Creator shaped or produced the sun and the moon and the heaven, the earth, the midregion (of air) and the region of the light[1] as in the preceding age (or creation):[2]

---

1. Bhūḥ, bhuvaḥ, svaḥ, mahaḥ, janaḥ, tapaḥ and satyam are the seven ~~lokas or~~ regions of the ~~entire~~ created ~~cosmos~~ ~~or brahmāṇḍa~~ according to the Ṛṣis and the first is the lowest and the last is the highest situated. The higher the loka the earlier will be its formation according to the orthodox view. But, it is to be noted that the samuccayārthaka 'ca' in the hymn in question is suggestive of the simultaneous creation of all the regions and not one by one.

2. Cf. the concluding portion of the hymn under discussion.

* ūrdhva (i.e. prominent or lofty)

sūryācandramasau dhātā yathāpūrvamakalpayat
divañca pṛthivīñcāntarikṣamatho svaḥ[1]

The creator is also called the ordainer or Supreme Controller of all the beings in the Universe (viśvasya miṣato vaśī). We may, thus, infer from this (as well as similar other instances elsewhere in the Saṃhitās) that to control and guide the (changing) movements and activities of the created universe[2] is also a necessary attribute of the Vedic Creator. Because the sūryācandramasau, i.e., the sun and the moon are capable

---

1. The background of Ṛta (cosmic order) and satyam (ultimate or abiding and absolute truth) here poses the regular arrangement of generation and extinction in the process of creation. Yathāpūrvam hits at a suitable moment for the start of each creation. Cf. the later paurāṇika concept of creation and destruction of the universe by Lord Viṣṇu at the beginning of a Kalpa. Thus Kalpa (originally meaning the act of creation) came to constitute one of the larger units of time in the purāṇas and time (काल) came to constitute one of the Lord's chief attributes, (Cf. Viṣṇupurāṇa 1.2.13-17, 1.2.63-66) by which he creates, sustains and destroys the universe which is described as ekarūpa when unmanifest or dissolved. Cf. [illegible] and [illegible] as denoting one of the eight important manifestations or mūrtis of Śiva in the Nāndī of Kālidasa's Śākuntalam.

2. Cf. the concept of परिणामिनी प्रकृति in later सांख्य and the modern concept of Changes in Energy ever from Kinetic to potential or static form in the Universe.

of being created again and again (may be times without number) by the same Creator, the created Universe can be conceived as practically anitya (transitory) and the creator as eternal (the contrast here is very clear) for he honours and even upholds the Eternal Law (Ṛta) and Truth (Satyam) in the cosmos during all such creations.

Thus, the lines of this hymn most decisively present the ~~xxxx~~ picture of a competent and eternal Creator responsible for the laws of Ṛta or the order of creation (sṛṣṭikrama) as well as uniformity and harmony in the working of the universe(satyam). Further, the order of creation - that first there was night (compatible with the concept of darkness or non-being at the very dawn of creation as discussed earlier), next were the primeval waters containing and hence the platform[1] of, the

---

1. Cf. the prefix 'adhi' in the opening line of Ṛgveda 10.190.2; also cf. Ṛgveda 9.108.8; and 1.105-15 for the interrelation of the concepts of Ṛta and Satya as spealt out above.

saṁvatsara[1] who having risen immediately ordains (Cf. vidadhat) the proper functioning of days and nights and becomes the controller of all beings, and as the last phase the creation of the various quarters of the Universe itself by the aforesaid saṁvatsara - who while engaged in this creation is called dhātā here - has been put forth in unequvivocal terms.

We have no hesitation, therefore, in declaring that this hymn represents quite a mature and advanced Vedic thinking on the problem of creation and is one of the most important summing-ups of the various destorted and unconnected passages indicating 'apparently' amaturish attempts or realisations of the phenomenon of creation.

IX. The Will Theory

The hymn called the nāsadiyasūkta or the song of creation[2] gives a comprehensive idea of the theory of

1. Saṁvatsara and dhātā in this hymn match suitably when compared to the Hiraṇyagarbha and the Agni respectively of the Hiraṇyagarbhasūkta; the first is merely potential energy before creation and the second in both the cases represents Active Energy engaged in and in relation with the created Universe. It is further gratifying to recall how Prajāpati is, later on, said to be the first creation of Ṛta (Cf. Taittirīya Āraṇyaka 1.23), Ṛta being identical with [illegible] or [illegible] (Cf. Nirukta of Yāska 4.19.9.

creation in the Saṁhitās and is full of stimulating suggestions to synthesize the different variegated visions of the 'creation phenomenon' as have been examined so far.

It would, therefore, be in the fitness of things to get acquainted with the text so charmingly translated into English by the great German ~~in~~ Indologist Max Muller:

"There was then neither what is, nor what is not, there was no sky, nor the heaven which is beyond. What covered ? Where was it ? and in whose shelter ? Was the water the deep abyss (in which it lay) ?

There was no death, hence was there nothing immortal. There was no light(distinction) between night and day. That one breathed by itself without, other than it there has been nothing.

Darkness there was, in the beginning a sea without light, the germ that lay covered by the husk, that one was born by the power of heat (tapas).

Love[1] overcame it in the beginning which was the seed springing from mind, poets having searched in their heart found by wisdom the bond of what is in what is not.

Their ray which was stretched across, was it below or was it above ? There were seed-bearers, there were powers, self-power below, and will above.

Who then knows, who has declared it here, from whence was born this creation ? The gods came later than this creation, who then knows whence it arose ?

He from whom this creation arose, whether he made it or did not make it, the highest seer in the highest heaven, he forsooth knows or does even he not know ?"

It may be noted that this hymn can be conveniently classed as essentially philosophical in the sense that not a single line assumes here the garb of vague

---

1. Kāmah most probably stands for a personified Desire only and not for love in the Rgveda. Cf. passages like यं कामये तंतमुग्रं कृणोमि तं ब्रह्माणं तमृषिं तं सुमेधाम् । Rgveda 10.125. This meaning is quite satisfactory in the present context. We might think, therefore, that कामः had not during the Vedic period acquired of love or sexual urge. On the contrary सो कामयत appears side by side with सः तपो तप्त signigying

mythology of any sort. It states the theory of creation in the Saṁhitās in a straightforward manner. The theory of the origin of the universe cannot be called pluralistic or even dualistic here.

The hymn unambiguously and significantly refuses to say anything about what existed before creation and according to it neither sat nor asat existed then. So far we have had only such conceptions of the Ultimate Reality from which the creation originates or is caused as were related to either being or non-being[1]. The thought expressed in similar already discussed hymns regarding the actual existence of primeval waters, a deep abyss, darkness, death, night etc. also is waived aside and is unacceptable to the seer at this stage of explaining his gradually unfolding vision of the phenomenon of creation in this hymn.[2] This difficult and abstract concept of the nature of the unmanifest state before creation (so to say) is brought home to us, however, by the allusions to and suggestions

---

a concerted motive to do something and an actual effort in mind, in the Upaniṣads.

1. Ṛgveda 10.129.1-2.

2. Ibid.

behind, the images of the sea enveloped in darkness[1] and of the germ (whose creative powers have not manifested themselves) covered by husk.[2] The recourse to the image of the supposed existence of a dark abyss of waters is just to convey the idea that everything was absent in the sense of being unmanifested and unknown, as well as, present because, the tapas (heat or energy) as a germ did possess the mahimā (potency or Śakti) to produce everything even then. This very tejas (energy) has earlier in the hymn, been referred to as the 'That one'(tadekaṁ) breathing by himself because nothing existed except it.[3] The tejas was (as

---

1. तम आसीत्तमसा गूळ्हमग्रे प्रकेतं सलिलं सर्वमा इदम्
   Ṛgveda, 10.129.3
2. Ṛgveda 10.129.3.
3. Ibid.10.129.2. Tadekaṁ as described here suggests "nothing beyond the positive and unitary character of the ultimate principle. We are here on the threshold of upaniṣadic Monism". Hiriyanna's Outline of Indian Philosophy, p.42.

it were) born (ajāyata) or it became manifest due to the force (mahimā) of heat (tapas)[1] which was inseparable from it previously as germ (or Grain) from husk before production of the sprout (Cf. tucchyenābhvapihitaṁ yadāsit ....tat......ajāyataikam[2] in which'tu.......hitam'is used as a meaningful metaphor for the unmanifest'tadekaṁ). It is clear that That one (i.e. Universal Consciousness)[3] other than which did not exist[4] manifested itself into so many aspects of the Universe in the course of time

---

1. Wilson translates 'tapasaḥ' by "austerity" meaning thereby the contemplation of the things that were to be created. Cf. Sayaṇa's commentary at this place. It appears that tapas suggests a principle explaining all sorts of movement, life and thought.

2. Ṛgveda 10.129.3

3. Umesha Mishra's A History of Indian Philosophy Vol.I p.59.

4. तस्माद्धान्यन्न परः किं चनास ।

   Ṛgveda 10.129.2.

(ajāyata denotes the manifestation which took place later in respect of time) only due to the Tejas, called Tapas, the Universal Light, the Energy. Then, there was the Will[1] (kāmah) which was the link between the Unmanifest and the Manifest. In the words of Dr.Radhakrishnan desire constitutes the secret of the being of the Universe, it is the 'sign of self-consciousness', 'the germ of the mind' and ' it denotes intellectual stir, the sense of deficiency as well as active effort.[2] It is the bond binding the existent to the non-existent.[3] Thus, that creation is the result of the active participation or Will of the creator is recognised here.

---

1. Rgveda 10.129.4. Desire of the Creator is accepted here as in some of the Indian School of Philosophy concerning the theory of creation later on, e.g., the Nyāyavaisesika. Lila and Vivarta theories of creation in the different schools of Advaita Philosophy present a great contrast when compared to this 'Will' aspect involved in the creation of the Universe.

2. Dr.Rādhākrishnan's Indian Philosophy Vol.I pp 99-105.

3. सतो बन्धुमसति निरविन्दन्हृदि प्रतीष्याकवयो मनीषा
Rgveda 10.129.4.

This will (kāmaḥ) would be ineffective without the contribution of the previously described tapas or Heat of Force inherent in the One Universal Consciousness.[1]

As to the gods, the hymn says, they are certainly of later origin,[2] but all the same we notice a vague extension of the varied phenomena of creation to find ultimate powers or energies (Cf. mahimānaḥ) in regions high up or down below described as correlative: 'begetters, mighty forces free action here and energy yonder.'[3] But this description is vague. Similar inconclusiveness and cautious approach overwhelmingly pervades the last two stanzas the first of which, extolls that the truth or real assessment about creation (i.e. whether, whence and how it took place) having not been perceived by anyone created later or known in

---

1. Cf. सः तपोऽतप्यत Praśnopaniṣat 1.3.4; स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति। Aitareya Upaniṣat 1.1.3; Bṛhadāraṇyaka 1.4.1-4; and the later concept of ईश्वर as कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः। Cf. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 6.11, 6.2.

2. Ṛgveda 10.129.6

3. Ṛgveda 10.129.5. Griffith's translation.

the first instance in the beginning, may remain practically unknowable or in plain words incommunicable for the theorists of all ages. That the perfect knowledge of this creation or Universe is imagined to be accessible, if at all, to its superintendent (asyādhyakṣaḥ) alone who lives in His highest region (parame vyoman) is the theme of the last stanza.

This thought that God - Supreme Reality or Authority alone is all-knowing (sarvajña) by dint of being the lone observer (evidence or sākṣī) of all the Universe is gracefully put forward in the last stanza. It is interesting to know how this very concept of sākṣimattva or 'one's being an observer' is developed in the later schools of Indian Philosophy, specially the Sāṁkhya and Vedānta. The unknowableness and the mysteriousness of creation (or universe for that matter) developed later into the concept of anirvacanīya māyā in Vedānta, and the indescribable nature of Reality devoid of the created objects as

as reflected in the opening of lines of this hymn predicts the later conception of nirguṇa brahman as 'yato vāco nivartante aprāpya manasā saha ' in the Upaniṣads.

But the most remarkable contribution of this hymn to the later theories of the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy[1] in particular and to Indian thought in general lies in the background of all creation as depicted here viz., the roles of jñānaśakti, the icchāśakti and the kriyāśakti emphasized through the forms of the Universal Consciousness[2], the Will-power[3], and then the actual act of Creation[4]. This is quite clear from our observations made above.

X. Conclusion.

From the account given so far of the Saṁhitās it

---

1. Cf. Kāśmīra Śaivism.
2. Ṛgveda 10.129.2
3. Ibid, 10.129.4
4. Ibid, 10.129.5-6.

has become obvious that the Ṛṣis having had the aparokṣānubhūti (direct realization) of the highest truth or knowledge (i.e. the mantras) have expressed them for the good or proper understanding of adhikārins (or men) of different categories of levels as revelations (Cf. Ṛṣayo mantradraṣṭāraḥ) of different visions of a single truth. They were, thus capable of giving out the highest and the noblest theories (if the term theory is to be used here at all) of creation for upadeśa most vividly. The original experience of the seers was only 'translated' (i.e. revealed through) into the Ṛk which was the only possible way of conveying a glimpse into the Reality to the non-seers (those who could not directly visualize the truth) . The next development was when, the Ṛks too, became incomprehensible and obscure and it became necessary to frame the six means (vedāṅgas) for bringing out and exploiting the full meaning and significance of the Ṛks.[1]

---

1. Cf. how Yāska explains the origin of the spoken mantras and later on of the vedāṅgas: साक्षात्कृतधर्माण ऋषयो बभूवुस्तेऽवरेभ्यो साक्षात्कृतधर्मभ्य उपदेशेन मन्त्रान् सम्प्रादुः । उपदेशाय ग्लायन्तोऽवरे बिल्मग्रहणायेमं ग्रन्थं समाम्नासिषुर्वेदं वेदांगानि च ।

   Nirukta 1.6.5.

Hence, the belief of the generality of modern scholars to class the mantras putting forth mature, higher or advanced views about Creation and Reality as of later origin on the basis of their supposition that the more ancient a theory the more undeveloped, simple, 'piecemeal' and naive it must appear to reason and *vice versa*, is to be rejected outright. After all, why should we not be impartial in agreeably viewing and accepting the Vedic Āryans as highly civilized and the Ṛṣis in those days really capable of giving out the very high thoughts that are contained in the Vedic Literature on the face of 'sound' reasons in support of the wisdom and the wealth of knowledge available to us in the Saṁhitās.

In fact, myriads of generations of the highest intellectuals of one of the greatest countries of the world like ours have thought it wise to seek inspiration or atleast confirmation of their doctrines in the Saṁhitās and the Upaniṣads. The noble concepts, immaculate reasoning and sublimity of expression characterized the common spirit of the Saṁhitās. The gradual

development of thought reflected in the different theories of creation can be ascribed to the various single visions of the same Truth realised by the different Ṛṣis. The same Truth pervades all the theories, as we have seen even the vision of non-being is not incompatible with that of absolute monism in practice.

Finally, we can conclude that only in words the theories differ and not in their essence, i.e., the common Truth or ground is reflected everywhere.[1] Thus, Sāyaṇa remarks in his commentary on Ṛṣi Vāmadeva's experiences:[2] Paramārtha-dṛṣṭyā kṛtsnamapi ahamevāsmi/ He janā māṁ sarvātmakaṁ paśyata // Yūyamapyevameva sva-svarūpaṁ anubhavatetyuktoṁbhavati.",

i.e. "From the point of reality I (Vāmadeva) am every-thing. O men ! know me all-pervasive. You people

---

1. Cf. passages like एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति, इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयते etc. ~~occurring repeatedly~~ in the Saṁhitās.

2. Ṛgveda 4.26.1-3.

also should, in the same way, realize your own nature. This is what has been said by Vāmadeva."

CHAPTER - III

The Upanisads

I. Introduction

Philosophical speculation continued[1] to blossom forth into yet more magnificient and developed theories of creation in the period of the Upanisads. We shall now, therefore, endeavour to take into ~~xx~~ stock the different points of view available to us in the upanisads concerning the problems of creation and evaluate their philosophical worth.

The settled recurrence of all happenings in nature filled the Upanisadic enquirer after truth with an impulse to find out the real meaning of all these phenomena. Hence, we find the primary search after the substratum of things or the ultimate reality which abides in the midst of change. The sage of Śvetāśvatara

---

1. See chapter II.

Upanisad[1] asks in wonder at the very beginning of his treatise: 'From whom are we born, in whom do we live and have our being ?' A cryptic formula of the Chandogya Upanisad declares that a man must compose himself in the belief that the world has come out of, lives in, and is finally absorbed in the absolute.[2] Likewise, the Taittiriya Upanisad declares that behind the cosmos there must be an existence which may be regarded as responsible for its origin, sustenance and absorption: 'that in truth from which all these beings come into existence, that by which they live, that into which they are finally absorbed, know that to be the eternal verily the absolute.[3]

II. The Absolute

According to this doctrine all objects are centered in the self, as all thoughts are centered in

---

1. किं कारणं ब्रह्म कुतःस्म जाता जीवाम केन क्व च संप्रतिष्ठाः ।
Śvetāśvataropaniṣad 1.1.
2. तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत । Chāndogyopaniṣat 3.14.1
3. यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते, येन जातानि जीवन्ति यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति तद्विजिज्ञासस्व तद्ब्रह्मेति । Taittiriyopanisad
~~Brhadaranyakopanisat 2.4.11.~~

in the mind, as all touches in the skin, as all waters in the ocean.[1] Ātman pervades all like salt in water.[2] The Supreme Brahman is independent of the universal rule of causality according to which all changes in the world proceed, it is celebrated as the imperishable (Akṣaram). The absolute changelessness of Brahman is very definitely expressed in some passages:-[3]

> As unity we must regard him
> Imperishable; unchanging,
> Eternal, not becoming, not ageing
> Exalted above space, the great self.

The immutable nature of Reality is taught in a famous line of Chāndogya Upaniṣad in the following words:

---

1. स यथा सर्वासामपां समुद्र एकायनमेवं सर्वेषां स्पर्शानां त्वगेकायनमेवं etc.
   ....
   Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat 2.4.11.

2. स यथा सैन्धवखिल्य उदके प्रास्त उदकमेवानुविलीयेत न हास्योद्ग्रहणायेव स्यात्.....वा अर इदं महद्भूतमनन्तमपारं विज्ञानघन एव।
   Ibid.2.4.12

3. एकधैवानुद्रष्टव्यमेतदप्रमेयं ध्रुवम्।
   विरजः पर आकाशादज आत्मा महान्ध्रुवः ॥
   Ibid.4.4.20

"Change (for example, ghaṭa is a derived form of earth) is a mere matter of words, earth (i.e., substance or reality) alone is True."[1] Brahman is also described as the knowing subject.[2] The relation of cause and effect (kāraṇa and kārya), source and result (hetu and phala), perceived and perceiving (dṛśya and draṣṭā) are unthinkable of the self-existant (Brahman or Reality).[3] In the whole creation there is no second outside of him,[4] no other distinct from him. There is here no plurality at all.[5]

Love of reality and dispassionate reasoning, however, obliged the Upaniṣadic thinker not only to

---

1. यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारंभणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्।
   Chhandogyopaniṣad 6.1.3.
2. Kaṭho. 4.3.; Māṇḍukyopaniṣat 3,4,5.
3. Māṇḍūkyakārikā 4.11, 31.
4. Bṛhadā.4.3.23, 30.
5. ...... नेह नानास्ति किंचन। मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति।
   Bṛhadā.4.4.19; Cf.also Kaṭho.~~4.10.11.~~ 2.1.10,11.

concede the reality of the manifold universe but at the same time to maintaining that all this is certainly Brahman itself.[1] Brahman, thus is defined as satyasya satyaṁ,[2] "the reality of reality", with the knowledge of which this entire universe becomes known.[3]

Later, the immutability of Brahman is preserved through the conception of transcendence. We have so far seen how the universe and the Brahman are identified as one and that the Reality is immanent in all this multiplicity of creation. Yet, it is said, it has not only created the whole of existence, not only has it brought it into being, but, having created this all has veritably entered into it.[4] The very fact of immanence here signifies its transcendence, for the upaniṣadic approach to reality is always through the

---

1. सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म । Chāndogya 3.14.1

2. Bṛhadā. 2.1.20

3. Mundakopaniṣat 1.3; Cf. also Bṛhadā. 2.4.5; 1.4.7; Chān. 6.1.3

4. यदिदं किञ्च । तत्सृष्ट्वा । तदेवानुप्राविशत् ।
Taittirīyopaniṣat 2.6.

universal to the transcendental. Anupraveśa does not indicate something like the entering of one thing into another but simply points to the fact that by the act of creation the supreme reality has made itself accessable to the intellect (buddhi), which again is the subtlest as well as the very first and foremost principle in creation.[1] Only the subtle can enter into the gross and the Brahman or supreme reality surpasses the intellect in subtleness. On the other hand we are told that, "other than the known, and more than the unknown is That."[2] Similarly, the classic 'Neti Neti' doctrine of Yājñavalkya points to the vilakṣaṇatva (distinctness) and another passage pūrṇatva (inexhaustible fulness) of reality.[3] Thus, the denial of attributes & qualifications to Brahman does not reduce it to a void. From the idealistic point of view the absolute Ātman alone enters into the self

---

1. इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा [redacted] अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः।
   मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिर्बुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः॥ Katho.3.10
2. अन्यदेव तद् विदिताद् अथो अविदितादधि
   Kenopaniṣat 3.
3. ॐ पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात्पूर्णमुदच्यते। पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय
   पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ।। (शान्तिपाठः)
   Īśopaniṣat.

through the self.[1]

The concept of māyā finds ample mention in the upanisads. It measures (māyate anayā) the immesurable, sets a limit to the limitless, for unless the vastness of the infinite (bhūma) is concealed it becomes impossible to represent it as small or finite.[2] This māyā or power of the Brahman has two functions - concealment and distraction. Such āvaraṇa or concealment[3] of truth or reality as well as such viksepa or distraction[4] are referred to again and again. The second function is also referred to in the famous line: 'indro māyābhiḥ pururūpa īyate' where the assuming of 'different and various' forms of objects

---

1. Māṇḍukyo.12.
2. यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह।
   Taittirīya. 2.9; Māṇḍū.७.
3. तदेतदमृतं सत्येन छन्नम्। Bṛhadā. 1.6.3; also Cf.
   अनृतपिधान Chā. 8.3.2.
4. Cf. Ṛgveda 6.47.18 रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव तदस्य रूपं प्रतिचक्षणाय । इन्द्रोमायाभि: पुरुरूप ईयते ।।
   and similar conformatory passage in later Bṛhadā. 2.5.19.

is attributed to a characterstically 'plural (i.e. manifold)' māyā or power of the supreme reality. It is remarkable that the concept of māyā is not that of illusion or nothing, instead it is described as 'the golden lid' which 'covers the face of truth'. [1] Again, it is sometimes called the 'truth' and then side by side the reality is called the 'immortal' symbolising thereby that the one is the empirical truth and the other absolute truth (satyasya satyaṁ).[2]

III. Theory of Emanation

According to this, "from the Ātman in the first instance, proceeded or emanated ~~space~~ ether, from ~~space~~ ether air, from air fire, from fire water, and from water

---

1. हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्य पिहितं मुखम्
   Isopanisat 15.

2. Bṛhadā 2.1.20

the earth"[1] Significantly enough, we have here a complete enumeration of the five different elements proceeding one after the other from the primeval Ātman, who does not play very active part in creation (for, we are not told that the Ātman creates. Cf. the use of the term sambhūtiḥ). The Ātman is not the creator but all 'that-come-to-be' are manifested through itself and not outside it. Thus, coming into existence and vanishing of the ākāśa etc. are different manifestations or forms of the Truth or Reality (ātman) which remains unchanged in essence. Ātman is thus in this theory only the source of the rise and disappearance of the objective universe and not a consciously exerting or active Creator. The akartṛtva or 'non-doing' nature of the Self in the absolutist theory is retained here but only the manifestations or creations are explained by way of illustrations (as for example those given below) as objective and not ephemeral. ~~Akkk~~ At the time of destruction, again,

---

1. तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः सम्भूतः । आकाशाद्वायुः, वायोरग्निः, अग्नेरापः, अद्भ्यः पृथिवी ।
Taittirīye. 2.1.

the earth would be dissolved in water, water in fire, fire in air, air in ether and ether in the eternal Ātman.[1] Lastly, we find a realistic and intelligible explanation of the origin and the destruction of the physical universe in this theory as opposed to the predominant absolutist theory of creation revealed in the Upaniṣads. Few more examples to this theory might not be out of place.

(1) "As a spider stretches forth and gathers together its threads, as herbs grow out of the earth, as from the living man come out the hair, so from the imperishable comes out the universe."[2]

(2) "As from a well-lit fire, sparks of like nature to it, arise thousandfold, so dear one, from the imperishable go forth manifold beings and return into it again. From Him is produced breath, mind and

---

1. Taittirīya 3.1. Cf. य एकोऽवर्णो बहुधा शक्तियोगाद्वर्णाननेकान्नि-हितार्थो दधाति। विचैति चान्ते विश्वमादौ स देवः स नो बुद्ध्या शुभया संयुनक्तु।।
Śvetāśvataropaniṣat 4.1.

2. यथोर्णनाभिः सृजते गृह्णते च यथा पृथिव्यामोषधयः संभवन्ति। यथा सतः पुरुषात्केशलोमानि तथाऽक्षरात्संभवतीह विश्वम्।।
Muṇḍako 1.1.7.

all the senses, ether, air, light, water, and earth which is the support of all the preceding four."[1]

IV. Doctrine of the Prāṇa

The concept of the absolute represents the supreme reality or that phase of reality which is transcendental, immutable, uncreated and undefined. But the Upaniṣads do recognise also another phase that consists of the principle of creation or activity. Whatever, i.e., all this world, issues forth from the moving Prāṇa.[2] All that is created here and in the heaven are under the control of prāṇa.[3] Just as all the spokes of a wheel are centered in the navel, similarly all these beings, and in fact, everything

---

1. तदेतत्सत्यं यथा सुदीप्तात्पावकाद्विस्फुलिङ्गाः सहस्रशः प्रभवन्ते सरूपाः। तथाऽक्षराद्विविधाः सोम्य भावाः प्रजायन्ते तत्र चैवापियन्ति॥
   Muṇḍaka. 2.1.1.

2. यदिदं किंच जगत्सर्वं प्राण एजति निःसृतम्।
   महद्भयं वज्रमुद्यतं य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति॥
   Kaṭha. 6.2.

3. प्राणस्येदं वशे सर्वं त्रिदिवे यत्प्रतिष्ठितम्।
   Praśna. 2.13.

that exists is centered in prāṇa.[1] In some of the highly suggestive and mythological accounts of the Upaniṣads prāṇa is established as supreme lord of all the elements namely ether, fire, water and earth[2] as well as of the organs of sense namely speech, mind eye and ear[3] and the deities[4] of the regions in the universe. All the beings, elements etc. also regularly dissolve into the prāṇa.[5] This indicates the metaphysical importance attached to the concept of prāṇa in the Upaniṣads. Agni (or prāṇa)[6] is called jātavedas (i.e. knower of all that is created) and according to further interpretation all created things know it because it is the source of and

---

1. यथा वा अरा नाभौ समर्पिता एवमस्मिन्प्राणे सर्वं समर्पितं
   प्राणः प्राणेन।
   Chā.7.15.1
2. Praśnopaniṣat 2.1-12.
3. Chā. 5.1.6-15.
4. Kauśītakyupa .3.2-9.
5. Chā.1.2.5; ibid 4.3.3.
6. Praśno.4.3.

remains in direct touch with them all.[1] It also exists eternally in every cycle of creation, it is being each and every manifestation.[2] Thus, it is clear that while Ātman or Brahman is the transcendental aspect of reality, prāṇa or agni is its creative or universally immanent aspect in the Upaniṣads.

Cosmic pulsation expresses itself in the concept of prāṇa i.e., that of the universal rhythmic movement of expansion and contraction.[3] In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Praśnopaniṣad[4] says that Prajāpati performed penance in order to create and thereafter generated a twin principle (mithuna) comprising of prāṇa and rayi, the sun and the moon, and it is their commingling which leads to the exberance of creation. Thus, the month is conceived as the creative agent (Prajāpati) of which the dark fortnight is rayi and the

---

1. Cf. Nirukta by Yāska, 7.5.
2. Ibid.
3. Cf. प्राणो वै समुंचनप्रसारणम्। Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 8.1.4.10; and also the concepts of प्राणन and अपानन, expiration and inspiration, belonging to प्राण, the life vibration, referred to in Ṛgveda 10.189.2.
4. Praśna.1.3,13.

bright one prāṇa.[1] Again, the two are also compared to night and day[2] respectively. The dark and the bright are the two movements which signify the basic law of creation and pervade all through - life and death, waking and sleeping, work and rest, youth and age, day and night. After referring to all the manifestations or creation known either as subjects or objects in the three states of waking, dreaming and deep-sleep which we may compare to the bright or visible half or prāṇa as has been pointed to earlier, the fourth facet or leg of the Ātman or reality is called invisible, beyond all manifestation, transcendent, the unusable, the end of all existence, the good and the non-dual which we may further liken to the rayi principle as pointed to above.[3]

Prāṇa is identified with the principles of life (āyuḥ), consciousness (prajñā) and the ultimate reality (ātman) - which is ageless and immortal and which does

---

1. Cf. the concept of रजस् (principle of motion) as शुक्ल and कृष्ण in Saṁhitā (Ṛgveda 6.9.1. and 3.5.5)
2. These two become शिव and शक्ति in tantras in which the symbol of Sun and Moon has been worked in greater detail.
3. See f.n. 4 of page 77

not increase by good actions nor diminish by bad actions.[1] Indeed, in the words of Prof. Ranade,[2] "it thus comes out that prāṇa is life from the biological point of views, consciousness from the psychological point of view, and Ātman from the metaphysical point of view. This is verily a philosophical apothesis of prāṇa."

We can, therefore, say that the Upaniṣads recognise a principle of unity-in-difference at the basis of creation of which prāṇa is one chief component. Prāṇa is the manifest, finite, moving, transitory, existing-only-in-name aspect of Brahman or reality whereas its other aspect is unmanifest, immortal, unmoved and even the Truth of the truth (i.e. really true as opposed to the apprent).[3] Thus, we see how in the process of creation the absolute or the transcendent comes to be known as the many or the Universe according to the doctrine of the prāṇa as revealed in the Upaniṣads.

---

1. Kauṣītakupa 3.2-9.
2. See <u>A Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy</u> by R. D. Ranade, p.92.
3. द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे मूर्तं चैवामूर्तं च मर्त्यं चामृतं च स्थितं च यच्च सच्च त्यच्च।
   etc. Bṛhadā. 2.3.1-6.

V. The Concept of Ether:

The Samskrit word for the so-called elements is 'bhūta', i.e. what has become, what has actually come to exist, or become a matter of fact. In other words, the one which was latent as existence (bhū), has become obvious or manifest. The potential, formless, unmanifest matter adopts forms and thus becomes manifest in these elements (though these are still in their elementary state). This will be clear from the following discussion about them.

It is maintained in the Upaniṣads that the ākāśa or ether is so-called because it is the medium through which light shines, or because all the heavenly lights like the sun and others shine through it.[1] According to sage Pravāhaṇa, all beings are verily born from the ether and merge into the ether and the ether alone is

---

1. आ समन्तात् काशन्ते दीपयन्ते सूर्यादयो यत्र।
   Cf. how modern scientific concept ether almost tallies with this ~~concept of ether~~. See also *Hindu Philosophies on Evolution*, pp. ~~45-48~~ by Balkrishna.

greater than these. Akasa is the last refuge or habitat (parayanam).[1] Akasa is identified as the omnipresent and eternal Brahman[2] and source of Air.[3] As the primeval pre-evalute matter it is stated to exist prefectly still[4] and without motion which we know, characterises matter in the processes of combination and distintegration. It is further interesting to note the true conception of ether reached in the last discourse of Chhandogya.[5] It is maintained that "the ether is verily made of name and form. That which is beyond this couple of name and form is Brahman. It is immortal." Truly, we can conclude that ether has been conceived as primeval, eternal and motionless material out of which after successive[6] transformations manifests this multitudinous diversity of the physical universe.

---

1. अस्य लोकस्य का गतिरित्याकाश इति होवाच सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतान्याकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्त आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्त्याकाशो ह्येवैभ्यो ज्यायानाकाशः परायणम्।
   Chha.1.9.1.
2. Brhada. 5.1; Chha. 3.12.7-9; Cf. √बृह > ब्रह्मन्, i.e., that which swells or evolves. Brahman thus denotes etymologically the unmanifest source from whom grew, evolve or emanate all that have come to exist(Cf. √भू सत्तायां + क्त > भूतानि)
3. Brhada. 5.1.
4. Chha 1.5.
5. आकाशो वै नाम नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्म तदमृतम् । Chha 8.14.
6. See f.n.1 of page 73.

However, there is an unknown controller or Conscious Energy which controls all these elements (bhūtāni) and worlds (lokaṁ paraṁ ca lokaṁ) from within, and which alone is real in the absolute sense.[1]

VI. The Concept of Air

Raikvya believed that the air is the final absorbent of all things. According to him,[2] "the air (vāyu) verily is the ultimate reality (saṁvarga) of all. When fire is extinguished it goes to the air, when the sun sets it goes to the air, when the moon sets it goes to the air, when the waters dry up they go to the air: thus verily is air the final absorbent of all things whatsoever." We can deduce from the above that the air is also the beginning of all things. This doctrine of Raikvya is crude as absorption of all things in the air is not intelligentally or logically worked out. Still, his boldness and independent approach to the problem of

1. Bṛhadā. 3.7.

2. Chā. 4.3.1-2.

creation is amply proved even by the simple fact that both water and fire (which many of his contemporaries regarded as the material substratum of all things) are stated to dissolve in the air.

VII. The Concept of Earth

The Chāndogya Upanisad opens with the statement that the earth constitutes the essence of all substances; water is the essence of earth, the annual herbs of the water, and man is the essence of the vegetables.[1] The advancement of the theory of earth as the primeval matter or origin sounds stange enough and seems to mark the crude imagination of the early Vedic speculations. The description above as such is lacking in coherent logic, scientific accuracy and convincing arguments.

VIII. The Concept of Water

The concept of water is very much prodominant from the time of the Saṁhitā itself. As such it is declared

---

1. एषां भूतानां पृथिवी रसः [illegible] 1.1.2.

in an Upaniṣad that "this non-being was verily water and full of motion like water."[1] Again, "all these beings are merely water. It is just water solidified, that is this earth, that is the atmosphere, that is the sky, that is the mountains, that is gods and men, that is animals and birds, grass, trees, beasts, together with worms, flies, and ants, all these are just water solidified."[2] Then Yājñavalkya in his well-known discussion with the lady philosopher Gārgī, echoes at the very outset that "all this world is woven warp and woof on water."[3] Elsewhere, we find the first cause of the universe propounded as

---

1. Bṛhajjābālopaniṣat 1.1.
2. Chā. 7.10.1; Also Cf. Bhṛgu's doctrine in Chapter 183 of the Śāntiparvan (Mahābhārata).
3. अथ हैनं गार्गी वाचक्नवी पप्रच्छ याज्ञवल्क्येति होवाच यदिदं सर्वमप्स्वोतं च प्रोतं च ।
   Chā. 3.6.1.

water: "In the beginning this world was just water. That water created the satya or Truth.[1] Satya created Brahmā, Brahmā created Prajāpati. And he (i.e. Prajāpati) created gods in his turn."[2] It is remarkable here that even the concept of God as creator of water itself has been cast off and the primeval waters alone are endowed with power to evolve the phenomenal multiplicity.

The primeval waters are spoken of as the universe of Brahman and the soul.[3] In Katha, again, the puruṣa is known as existing before the primeval waters[4] and the

---

1. सत्यम् in this context is later (cf. Bṛhadā. 5.5.1) explained as ultimate "concrete" existent; Cf. the concept of भूतानि or 'the existents' as व्यक्तमध्यानि as well as अव्यक्तादीनि and अव्यक्तनिधनानि in Bhagwadgitā. See also lines 12-23 on p.77 of R.D.Ranade's *A Constructive Survey of the Upaniṣads*.
2. Bṛhadā 5.5.1.
3. Kauṣītakyupaniṣat 1.7.
4. यः पूर्वं तपसो जातमद्भ्यः पूर्वमजायत।
गुहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्तं यो भूतेभिर्व्यपश्यत॥
Kathopaniṣat 4.6.

latter are to be understood by "aditi" the sustainer of the god that springs forth together with all the elements to life.[1] Primeval waters are the product of the Ātman dwelling in the Heart[2] (in which the heaven and the earth are confined).[3] Waters are often described as the chief material which the Ātman creates in the beginning for further creation.[4] The Ṛgvedic concept of Hiraṇyagarbha is also several times referred to in the Upaniṣads according to which Hiraṇyagarbha came forth as the first born of creation from the primeval waters which were created by the first principle.[5]

---

1. या प्राणेन संभवत्यदितिर्देवतामयी ।
   गुहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्तीं या भूतेभिर्व्यजायत ॥
   Kāṭho.4.7
2. Ibid.
3. Chha. 8.1.3.
4. Cf. the concept of हिरण्यगर्भ प्रजापति in Ṛgveda 10.81,82; Satapatha 6.1.1, Aitareyopaniṣat 1.1, I'sopa.4; Mahānārāyaṇop. 1.4.
5. Ibid; Ṛgveda 10.121.1; Aitareyop. 3.3.; Brahadā. 4.4.4; See page 199, The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads by Deussen; Kauṣitak. 1.7, Among the later Upaniṣads mention may be made of Nārāyaṇop. 1; Atharvaśiras 6, Pindo.1; Garudo 1; Mahānāra. 4; Nṛsimhottarop. 9, in whom, this concept puts on the Garb of the mythological Nārāyaṇa etc.

IX. The concept of Fire:

In a beautiful episode of the Chāndogya King Jaivāli declares everything to have originated from fire. Yonder region, clouds, earth, man and woman all are verily fire.[1] Kathopanisad also tells us that fire having entered the universe assumed all forms.[2]

But the most advanced theory of creation involving fire as a chief contributory is to be found in what Uddālaka says in the Chāndogya.[3] The evolution of three elements - fire, water and earth from one another and ultimately from the self-existent, i.e. Brahman, is described and established systematically: "He (the sat or Plenum) proposed - I will be many, will propagate myself. Accordingly He created heat (Tejas). This heat proposed - I will become many, will propagate myself. Accordingly He created the waters (āpah). Therefore, when a man feels the heat ~~of pain~~ or perspires, water is produced from the heat. These

---

1. Chā. 5.3.8.
2. अग्निर्यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव ।
   Katho.2.5. Cf. the close affinity between these lines and Ṛgveda 6.47.18.
3. Chā. 6.2.

waters proposed - we will become many, will propagate ourselves. Accordingly they created food (annam). Therefore, when it rains, abundant food is produced, for from waters is produced food for man's eating." Then, the self-existent is said to enter as individual soul (jīvātman) into the three deities or elements created. Furthermore, the sat or self-existent is said to have made threefold these elements by alloying each of them with equal and constituent portions of the other two. Thus the created fire contains one half of the original tejas, one fourth of the original (or pure) water and one fourth of the amount of the unadulterated earth. Similar is the case with the worldly water and earth. Thus, for example, it is shown of fire, sun, moon and lightening, that the red in them consists of heat, the white of water, the black of food. Evidently these pure elements and alloyed elements in this theory possess the earliest germ of the later concepts of the pure substances (sūkṣmabhūta or tanmātrā) and gross elements (sthūlabhūta or mahābhūta). It is interesting, however, to note in this connection how praśnopaniṣad[1] first draws this distinction as to that

1. Praśnopaniṣat 4.8.

between earth and earth-substance, water and water-substance, heat and heat-substance, the ether and the ether-substance. The term pṛthivīmātrā, āpomātrā, tejomātrā, vāyumātrā and ākāśamātrā were comprehended under the term tanmātrā i.e., 'subsisting from that alone' in the later Upaniṣads.[1]

X. The Concept of Organic Nature:

Speaking from the highest viewpoint the Upaniṣads find the universe and Brahman as essentially one and the same reality, but in order to intellectually explain the concept of the relation as seems to exist between cause and effect, and that of the creation of the universe to the common man, who has not realized the highest truth they rather pose to represent a creation of the universe, so very vast and varied and hence ~~xxxxxx~~ inexplicable, in their own way. That is also why sṛṣṭi or creation standing for a discharge, a

1. Maitrīup. 3.2.; Prāṇāgnihotropaniṣat 4; Cf. also how the number of elements increasing to fire (Taittirīyop.2.1.), the same process of compounding is extended to [illegible]. See Vedāntasāra, for example.

setting free or emission, an emergence or emanation of the universe from the Brahman in the Upaniṣadic philosophy presents a contradiction to the professed immutability and attributelessness of Reality or Brahman.

Thus, it is said that the Brahman himself having created the universe has entered up to the finger tips.[1] This shows a remarkable ingenuity and genuine effort towards a compromise between the concept of the sole reality of the Brahman on the one hand and the multiplicity of the practical universe on the other.

In this way, we find that the Ātman having created has entered into the three deities (i.e. the elements) with this living self (jīvenātmanā, i.e. as the jīva self ~~the individual soul~~) and separated thence name and form.[2] Again, having created

---

1. Bṛhadā.1.4.7. Cf. Taittrīyopaniṣat 2.6.
2. तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणीति सेयं देवतेमास्तिस्रो देवता अनेनैव जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरोत्।
   Chā.6.3.3.

the organisms as citadels (puras) the Brahman enters into them as citizen, i.e. as soul.[1] As individual he has entered into all living creatures, plants,[2] animals, men, gods etc.[3] Aitareya thus enumerates the several gods, elements, lights, creaturesand the insects, the motinless, the world regions and this entire universe as being equal[4] to this 'consciousness or Ātman) principle itself. [5] Soul's migration extends to the plant world[6] and gods[7] also according to work or

---

1. तदेतदृषिः पश्यन्नवोचत् । पुरश्चक्रे द्विपदः पुरश्चक्रे चतुष्पदः । पुरः स पक्षी भूत्वा पुरः पुरुष आविशदिति । स वा अयं पुरुषः सर्वासु पूर्षु पुरिशयो नैनेन किंचनानावृतं नैनेन किंचनासंवृतम् ।

   Bṛhadā. 2.5.18.

2. Chhā 6.11.1.

3. तस्माच्च देवा बहुधा संप्रसूताः साध्या मनुष्याः पशवो वयांसि ।
   प्राणापानौ व्रीहियवौ तपश्च श्रद्धा सत्यं ब्रह्मचर्यं विधिश्च ।

   Mundakopanisat 2.1.7; Cf. Also Ṛgveda 10.90 and Atharvaveda 11.4.3.

4. यद्वेव समः प्लुषिणा समो मशकेन समो नागेन सम एभिस्त्रिभिर्लोकैः समोऽनेन सर्वेण तस्माद्वेव सामाश्नुते साम्नः सायुज्यं... ...... ।

   Bṛhadā 1.3.22.

5. Cf. Aitareyopanisad 1 and the commentary of Śaṅkarācārya on it.

6. योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते शरीरत्वाय देहिनः । स्थाणुमन्येऽनुसंयन्ति यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम् ।

   Kathopanisat 5.7.

7. तद्यथा पेशस्कारी पेशसो मात्रामपादायान्यन्नवतरं कल्याणतरं रूपं तनुत एवमेवायमात्मेदं शरीरं निहत्याविद्यां गमयित्वान्यन्नवतरं कल्याणतरं-

knowledge.[1]

XI. The concept of Puruṣa

The puruṣa sūkta[2] of Ṛgveda, it seems has inspired the creation myth occuring at the beginning of the aitareyopaniṣad.[3] The myth occurs thus:"In the beginning the Ātman alone was the universe; He deliberated - I will create worlds". Accordingly after he had created the earth and atmosphere, the waters above and below, he drew forth the puruṣa from the waters, and gave him shape. Brooding over these waters they opened 'like an egg', the mouth, nose, eyes etcetera of which are then developed, and from them the eight psychical organs, and from these in turn agni, vāyu, āditya etc. as the eight guardians of the universe, who finally take up their abode in men as speech, breath, sight etcetera Although the human body is thus animated by the organs of sense that spring from the puruṣa, it can, however, only exist after the creator 'through the fissure of the

रूपं कुरुते पित्र्यं वा गान्धर्वं वा दैवं वा प्राजापत्यं वा
ब्राह्मं वान्येषां वा भूतानाम् ।
Bṛhadā 4.4.4.

1. Chāndogyop. 6.10.2; Kauṣitakī 1.2.
2. Ṛgveda 10.90
3. Aitareyopniṣat 1.1.4.

skull' has entered into it as the individual soul. The spirit of this myth thus resembles greatly the hymn of the Ṛgveda referred to above. "But the puruṣa that in Ṛgveda had been the first principle, becomes here a power dependent on the Ātman; and similarly the organs of the man's soul are ascribed to the puruṣa but the soul itself to the Ātman".[1]

XII. The Concept of Being and Non-Being.

Sometimes the Upaniṣads suggest that Non-being was the primeval existent. So the Taittirīya Upaniṣad tells us that at the beginning of all things what existed was non-being. From it was born being. Being shaped itself of its own accord. It is thus that it is called the well-made or self-made.[2] Bṛhadāraṇyaka states thus, 'In the beginning verily nothing was existent but that everything was covered by 'Death' or

---

1. See The Philosophy of the Upanishads by Deussen, p.188.
2. असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत् । ततो वै सदजायत । तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत । तस्मात्तत्सुकृतमुच्यत इति। यद्वै तत्सुकृतम् ।

Taittirīyopaniṣad 2.7.

'Hunger', for Hunger is verily Death. Death made up its mind, let me have a self, and thus worshipping he began to move. From his worshipping were born the waters. The froth of the waters solidified and became earth. Death toiled on the earth, and as a result of his toil, fire was produced.[1]'

Chhāndogya connects the philosophy of non-being with the myth of the universal egg. So it is said 'What existed in the beginning was non-being. It then

---

1. नैवेह किंचनाग्र आसीन्मृत्युनैवेदमावृतमासीत्। अशनायया अशनाया हि मृत्युस्तन्मनोऽकुरुतात्मन्वी स्यामिति। सोऽर्चन्नचरत्तस्यार्चत आपोऽजायन्तार्चते वै मे कमभूदिति तदेवार्कस्यार्कत्वं कं ह वा अस्मै भवति य एवमेतदर्कस्यार्कत्वं वेद॥ आपो वा अर्कस्तद्यदपां शर आसीत्तत्समहन्यत। सा पृथिव्यभवत्तस्यामश्राम्यत्तस्य श्रान्तस्य तप्तस्य तेजोरसो निरवर्तताग्निः।

Bṛhadā. 2.1.2; Cf.

Ṛgveda 10.129 where it is said that in the beginning there was neither Being nor Non-being, but that what existed was only an ocean of Night; and also Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 2.8.9.

converted itself into Being. It grew and became a vast egg.[1] It lay in that position for the period of a year, and then it broke open. Its two parts were, one of gold and the other of silver. The silvery part became the earth, and the golden part became the heaven. The thick membrane became the mountains; the thin membrane became the clouds; the arteries of the egg became the rivers of the world; the fluid in its interior became the ocean; while what came out of the egg was the sun. When the sun was born, shouts of hurrah arose.[2]

---

1. Cf. also: अन्तरिक्षोदरः कोशो भूमिबुध्नो न जीर्यति दिशो ह्यस्य स्रक्तयो द्यौरस्योत्तरं बिलं स एष कोशो वसुधानस्तस्मिन्विश्वमिदं श्रितम् ।

Chandogya 3.15.1.

2 असदेवेदमग्र आसीत् । तत्सदासीत्तत्समभवत्तदाण्डं निरवर्तत तत्संवत्सरस्य मात्रामशयत तन्निरभिद्यत ते आण्डकपाले रजतं च सुवर्णं (सा द्यौर्यज्जरायु ते पर्वता यदुल्बं स मेघो नीहारो या धमनयस्ता नद्यो यद्वास्तेयमुदकं स समुद्रः । अथ यत्तदजायत सोऽसावादित्यस्तं जायमानं घोषा उलूलवोऽनूदतिष्ठन्सर्वाणि च भूतानि सर्वे च कामाः ।

Chandogya 3.19.1-3.

The concept of cosmic egg here sounds original and even scientific to some extent as we know that the contraction of the earth's crust (Cf. the outer membrane of the mundane egg) brought about elevations and depressions of the sea floor and its surface.

Non-being in such instances does not mean that nothing existed in the beginning. It only suggests that the world of creation was in its original state unmanifest, because, non-being cannot by any stretch of imagination change itself, or create, or be the primeval ground of being (especially the diverse universe).[1] Again, in all these instances the manners of creation from the Non-being evidently brings home to us the existence of something indistinct, unmanifest (Avyākṛta)

---

1. Cf. असदिति व्याकृतनामरूपविशेषविपरीतमव्याकृतं ब्रह्मोच्यते । न पुनरत्यन्तमेवासत् । न ह्यसतः सज्जन्मास्ति । इदमिति नामरूपविशेषवद्व्याकृतं जगत् अग्रे पूर्वं प्रागुत्पत्तेर्ब्रह्मैवासच्छब्दवाच्यमासीत् । ततोऽसतो वै सत्प्रविभक्तनामरूपविशेषमजायतोत्पन्नम् ।
Saṅkarācārya on Taittirīya. 2.7.

undeveloped and undifferentiated as the background of the world which became manifestated or differentiated by name and form.[1]

The Upanisad itself[2] criticizes the non-being hypothesis about the primeval existent: 'How could it possibly be so, how could Being came out of Non-being, existence from non-existence ? It is necessary for us to suppose that at the beginning verily all this was Being, and it was alone and without a second. ~~This~~

---

1. तद्धेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत्तन्नामरूपाभ्यामेव व्याक्रियतासौनामायमिदंरूप इति तदिदमप्येतर्हि नामरूपाभ्यामेव व्याक्रियतेऽसौनामायमिदंरूप इति स एष इह प्रविष्टः । आ नखाग्रेभ्यो यथा क्षुरः क्षुरधानेऽवहितः स्याद्विश्वंभरो वा विश्वंभरकुलाये तं न पश्यन्ति । अकृत्स्नो हि स प्राणन्नेव प्राणो नाम भवति । वदन्वाक्पश्यंश्चक्षुः शृण्वञ्श्रोत्रं मन्वानो मनस्तान्यस्यैतानि कर्मनामान्येव ।
Bṛhadā. 1.4.7

2. सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् । तद्धैक आहुरसदेवेदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयं तस्मादसतः सज्जायत । कुतस्तु सोम्यैवं स्यादिति होवाच कथमसतः सज्जायेतेति । सत्त्वेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् ।
Chāndo. 6.1.12.

This primeval Being reflected, let me be many - let me produce; having bethought thus to itself it produced fire. . . . ' Further, it is said that from it were produced waters and they created the earth (food or matter) and the Upaniṣad goes on to formulate the famous Trivṛtkaraṇa doctrine which we have already discussed.[1] The Being in this case is endowed with consciousness, will and energy[2] (jñāna, icchā and kriyā) the three functions which are demonstrated in his creative process above. This is indeed a major and praiseworthy theory advanced for the solution of the problem of creation.

XIII. The Concept of Personal God

The existence of the early Vedic Gods like Indra, Varuṇa etc. is not denied in the upaniṣads, though here they are shown like ordinary human beings and as

---

1. See the section devoted to 'The Concept of Fire' earlier.

2. Cf. the oft-repeated terms जीवेनात्मना प्रविश्य, तदैक्षत and स तपोऽतप्यत respectively in the Upaniṣads. Cf. also Ṛgveda 10.129 where, too, these three are discernable.

created by and dependent on the Ātman.[1] The Gods, however, retain immortality.[2] Not only their power[3] but their knowledge[4] also is dependent on Brahman. Another notable characterstic of Upanisadic theism is its monism. Anyone having known Brahman (which is no other than his Ātman) becomes Brahman itself.[5] Another use made of these individual Gods is to make them appear as symbolical representatives of the Ātman.[6]

The omnipotent, eternal and omnipresent Ātman is celebrated as the inner guide (antaryāmin) in all the

1. स यथोर्णनाभिस्तन्तुनोच्चरेद्यथाग्नेः क्षुद्रा विस्फुलिंगा व्युच्चरन्त्येवमेवास्मादात्मनः ... सर्वे देवा सर्वाणि भूतानि व्युच्चरन्ति ।
Brhadā 2.1.20; Katho.4.9; Aitareyo.1.1.3.
2. यच्छ्रेयसो देवानसृजताथ यन्मर्त्यः सन्नमृतानसृजत — तस्मादतिसृष्टिः ।
Brhadā.1.4.6
3. Kenopanisat 14-28; Brhadā.3.7; Taittiriyop.2.8; Katho.6.3; Kausitaki 1.5.
4. Chāndogyopanisat 8.7.1-4.
5. Chāndo.8.12.6; Brhadā 1.4.10.
6. Indra in Brhadā.1.5.12; Aitareyo.1.3.; Kausi.2.6.3.1; Varuna in Taittiriyop.3.1; Prajāpati in Chāndo.8.7.

parts and forces of nature and of mankind.[1] Though imperishable (akṣaram) and untouched by good and bad actions, at its bidding the sun and the moon hold their positions.[2] Ātman dwelling within the heart is the chief Lord, the governor of the universe who guides and protects the smooth working of the different parts of the universe.[3] The knowledge of this Ātman depends on the lord's grace.[4]

It is in Śvetāśvatara that God and soul are clearly distinguished[5] from one another, although the original identity is not denied[6] and, the removal of this illusion of difference between them appears there

---

1. Bṛhadā. 3.7.3-23.
2. Ibid 3.8.9.
3. Ibid 4.4.22.
4. Kaṭho. 2.20;23; Śvetāśvataropaniṣat. 3.20;
5. Cf. also (as light and shadow) ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहां प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्धे । छायातपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति पञ्चाग्नयो ये च त्रिणाचिकेताः । Kaṭho. 3.1.
6. Śvetāśvataropaniṣat 4.6,7 (Repeated in Muṇḍakop. 3.1.1,2); Cf. also Ṛgveda 1.164.20.

as a grace of the supreme god.[1] This universe is, thus, declared the maya or illusion caused by the lord.[2] Again, the chief function of Īsvara or God is described to be as of bringing the actions (karmans) to maturity and apportioning their fruit to the souls (jīvas).[3] The Īsvara is endowed with divine grace for the highest good of the jīvas. "Some people say" says the Upanisad, "that it is time, others nature, others necessity, other chance, others the elements, yet others, the person, still others the combination of these and yet a few others the Ātman, which is the cause of all things whatsoever."[4] All these theories are criticized in the Śvetāśvatara and it puts forth a constructive scheme of śaivite theism in explanation of the creation problem. God is the very time of time, Death to the very god of death;[5] Nature itself is matured by the presence of God inside it.[6] Necessity

1. Śvetāśva. 1.6.
2. Ibid 4.10
3. This concept of the Almighty Īsvara is still popular in Indian Tradition.
4. Śvetāśva. 1.2.
5. Ibid 6.2; 6.16; 3.10.
6. Ibid 5.5.

or chance are respectively too fatalistic and too unphilosophical explanations. Elements are God's garment and it is due to His supreme skill in work that earth, water, fire, air and ether were created.[1] Their combination cannot be the origin of creation because we must have an Eternal Being who is the primal cause of their combination.[2] Īśvara, being the creator, is in eternal union with māyā which is His own power,[3] is properly speaking the 'means whereby' the Great Magician (māyin) operates.[4] In fact, His supreme power is said to be of many kinds: knowledge, will and action are natural to Him.[5] He is the supreme Godhead to whose power is due the whirling round of the wheel of the universe.[6] He is the supreme cause - the self-subsisting mover of the unmoving manifold and causes

---

1. Ibid 5.2; 6.11.
2. Ibid 6.1.
3. Ibid 6.8.
4. I.H.Q. Vol.XI, Sept.1935.
5. स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च । Śvetāśva 1.3.
6. Ibid. 3.2; 6.1.

the one primal seed to sprout in infinite ways.[1]

The assigning of the above personal attributes to a Lord (Creator) seems to have been inspired by an unconscious recognition of the apparent 'reality' and richness of the empirical experience. Hence, although the theism of Śvetāśvatara is attached to the cult of Śiva, Viṣṇu, Nṛsiṁha etc. in the later Upaniṣads,[2] yet even in them the original idealism (i.e. the sole reality of the absolute) which dissolves the Universe and gods in Ātman reveals itself. For example, in Nṛsiṁhottaratāpanīyopaniṣad the fourth (turīya) or highest state of the soul is represented as the abyss of the eternal unity in which all distinctions of being and knowing vanish, the entire expanse of the universe is obliterated, "and even Īśvara (the eternal god) is swallowed up by the turīya (fourth).[3]

XIV. The Concept of Dualism

In the Praśnopaniṣad Pippalāda conceives the

---

1. Ibid 6.9; 6.12.
2. Maitrāyaṇyupaniṣat 6.8.
3. Nṛsiṁhottaratāpanīyopaniṣat 1.

notion of a duality of primary existance, rayi and prāṇa, or matter and spirit (created first by the Creator after penance). Thus, it is said that moon is matter - while the sun is spirit, the dark half of the month is matter - while the bright one is spirit, the night is matter while the day is spirit and so on. It was in this way that the Creator was able to create all the dual existence.[1] Such duality apparently seems mythological and its real contribution is made explicit in our discussion of the concept of Prāṇa.

At another place the creator is said to create in the same way and thus become himself both the manifest and unmanifest, the defined and the undefined, the supported and the unsupported, the conscious and the unconscious and the true and the false.[2] This description sounds more philosophical and we can see in it the earliest seed of the later concept of satkāryavāda.

---

1. Praśno 1.3-13.
2. सोऽकामयत। बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति । स तपोऽतप्यत। स तपस्तप्त्वा। इदं सर्वमसृजत । यदिदं किं। तत्सृष्ट्वा । तदेवानुप्राविशत्। तदनुप्रविश्य। त्यच्चाभवत्। निरुक्तं चानिरुक्तं च। निलयनं चानिलयनं च। विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च। सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत्।यदिदं किंच। तत्सत्यमित्याचक्षते।
Taittiriyopaniṣat 2.6.

Sometimes the Personal Creator is said to have desired a consort or wife (jāyā) in the beginning of creation and thus can be compared to human experience.[1] In Bṛhadāraṇyaka, this analogy is further detailed. Thus tired of lonliness He divided Himself into two - husband and wife, horse and mule, ox and cow ..... the male and the she ant.[2] In this instance the composite working of the process of creation is boldly explained as male and female - both of them opposite types and the fact that there cannot be a creation or generation (as we see in the above cases) without two is expressly recognised. The male and the female elements can be compared to the plus and minus currents together producing electricity.

The male principle can be compared to the seed of active desire, or a conscious energy possessing it and female to the ground having the latent capacity to generate or expand, or unconscious energy - both being

---

1. आत्मैवेदमग्र आसीदेक एव सो ऽकामयत जाया मे स्यादथ प्रजायेयाथ वित्तं मे स्यादथ कर्म कुर्वीयेत्येतावान्वै कामो नेच्छंश्चनातो भूयो विन्देत्तस्मादप्येतर्ह्येकाकी कामयते जाया मे स्यादथ प्रजायेयाथ वित्तं मे स्यादथ कर्म कुर्वीयेति स यावदप्येतेषामेकैकं न प्राप्नोत्यकृत्स्न एव तावन्मन्यते।
Bṛhadā. 1.4.17.

2. Ibid. 1.4.2-4.

forms or creations of the one source of Conscious Cosmic energy which has to assume the twin forms in order to give expression to all its own being, in the present context the manifest universe.

Lastly, it is remarkable that this theory too, like all other important and advanced theories of creation in the Upaniṣads recognises the hand of a Conscious Energy in the phenomenon of creation of the entire universe.

XV. The Concept of Time

Kāla or time as the first cause of the universe, first occurs in the Atharvaveda itself[1] where it is stated to be the tremendous force behind creation. The Maitrī Upaniṣad[2] supports this theory:-

---

1. Atharvaveda 19.54; Cf. also Bhāgavata 2.6.41-42.
2. Maitrī Upaniṣat 6.14.

"From Time flew forth created things.
From Time too, they advance to growth.
In Time too, they do disappear.
Time is a form and formless too.
'tis Time that cooks created things,
All things, indeed, in the Great Soul.
In what, however, Time is cooked. . .
Who knows that, he the Veda Knows!
This embodied Time is the great ocean of creatures."

In the Śvetāśvatara the Creator[1] Iśāna Rudra[2] is extolled as the yoni[3] or sole cause[4] of beings, as sarvajña (all-knowing) and beyond kāla or the trinity of time[5] the eternal cover of all this[6] the

---

1. स विश्वकृद्विश्वविदात्मयोनिर्ज्ञः कालकालो गुणी सर्वविद्यः । Śvetāśva. 6.10
2 एको हि रुद्रो न द्वितीयाय तस्थुः य इमाँल्लोकान् ईशत ईशनीभिः । प्रत्यङ्जनांस्तिष्ठति संचुकोपान्तकाले संसृज्य विश्वा भुवनानि गोपाः ॥ Śvetāśva. 3.2.
3 यच्च स्वभावं पचति विश्वयोनिः। Ibid.5.5.
4 स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता न चाधिपः। Ibid 6.9.
5 येनावृतं नित्यमिदं सर्वम्। Ibid. 6.2.
6 कालकालः Ibid.6.2,6.; आदिः परस्त्रिकालादकलोऽपि दृष्टः। Ibid 6.5.; कालं तथान्ये परिमुह्यमानाः। Ibid 6.1.

own self of everything,[1] or annam[2] (i.e. the elements) and all attributes.[3] He is also the efficient cause of the intermediate stage between creation and creator, or the first manifestation (saṁyoganimittahetu).[4] As the indweller of beings[5] He even absolves them at the end of time (antakāla)[6] having created them first. Ādisaṁyoga here stands as the meeting point whence creation originates or the one lord Controller (rudra) starts creating and making the seed of many as diverse objects.[7] This creation or the rise of many from the one source is in vain termed as chance or natural as

---

1. See f.n. 3 of page 107; स्वभावमेके कवयो वदन्ति कालं तथाऽन्ये। परिमुह्यमानाः । देवस्यैष महिमा तु लोके येनेदं भ्राम्यते ब्रह्मचक्रम्।।
   Ibid 6.1.
2. अहमन्नमन्नमदन्तमद्मि । Taittirīyopaniṣat 3.10.6.
3. Śvetāśvatarop. 6.1.
4. आदिः स संयोगनिमित्तहेतुः । Ibid.6.1.
5. कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः। Ibid.6.11; ~~Incidentally we may note how the same words~~ are repeated ~~in the Gītā also.~~
6. Śvetāśvatero.3.2.
7. एको वशी निष्क्रियाणां बहूनामेकं बीजं बहुधा यः करोति। Ibid.6.12.

well as the time factor (kāla), because the cycle of creation (brahmacakra) - is run by the mahimam or great power of the Lord.[1] Though this brahmacakra apparently implies[2] the coming into being, remaining into existence, or fading into the past or getting dissolved of the created objects, and thus affords a fair comparision with the mystical Time or Chance driving the cycle of utpatti, sthiti, and laya, the Creator Lord is beyond that cakra or cycle of Brahman or Reality as conceived in the limits of time (and also space). We may thus understand that before creation exists Energy or Creator unmoving and at the start of creation the wheel of time as it were is set into motion by the Creator Himself.

Kala or time has been described as the very essence or at any cost as an attribute of the Creator Lord in all Pauranika mythologies concerning creation. This proves the uniqueness and potential universality of the time factor in relation to the problem of creation.

---

1. स्वभावमेके कवयो ~~[illegible]~~ see f.n.1 of page 108.
2. तेनेशितं कर्म विवर्तते ह पृथ्व्याप्तेजो निलखानि चिन्त्यम्।
   Ibid.6.2.

The doctrine of the destruction or dissolution into and then the creation afresh of the universe from, the same source, i.e., the creator or supreme (Brahman) is found at several places throughout Vedic literature including the latest upaniṣads.[1] The Śvetāśvatara, again significantly puts forth the doctrine of the periodical dissolution and recreation of the universe by the Lord.[2] The reason for such cyclic recreation in terms of time (cf. the concept of beginning and end of the beings or things in the universe in a regular way) is stated thus:-

> 'That which he created he then takes back again,
> Becoming one with the being of being:
> In order then........
> To begin afresh the work rich in guṇas,
> Apportioning to each their attributes.'[3]

That it is only the soul's actions which prompt the

---

1. Cf. Ṛgveda 10.190.3; Vājasaneyisaṁhitā 32.8; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 11.3.3.1; 13.7.1.1.; Bṛhadā. 1.2.1, 1.5.3; Katho.2.25; Māṇḍūkyo. 1.6; Muṇḍako 1.1.7; Nārāya. 1; Cūliko. 17-18.
2. Śvetāśvataropaniṣad 3.2.; Cf. also सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत् । Ṛgveda 10.190.3
3. Śvetāśvataropaniṣad 6.3.4.

creator to "apportion to each their attributes" (Sarvān bhāvān viniyojayat) is immediately asserted next:

"Where they are not there action comes to nought,
Thither he departs, actionless, in reality another."

Where the bhāvas which constitute the empirical nature are destroyed by knowledge in the case of a soul and actions come to a nought and a recreation no longer takes place.

XII Conclusion

Thus, we may conclude that in the period of the Upanisads several new and developed solutions were speculated on the problem of creation, although many of them are discernable in seeds even as early as in the Samhitā literature. Further, it will become positively obvious through comparision with the latter that several of these concepts were fruitfully transmitted by the Upanisads and adopted by the much later systems of Vedānta and Sāmkhya etc. in the History of Indian Philosophy. Flashes of divine intuitive realization enabled the 'seers' of the Vedic

age right from the period of the Saṃhitās to the very Upaniṣadic times, not only to retain uniform and transmit intact the universal truth about the 'creation' phenomenon but also to reveal it inspiredly in highly suggestive, symbolic and scientific language. Indeed, the whole orthodox tradition of philosophical thinking in India has preserved and revered the high wisdom and reliability of the Veda which is often described as divine or as the very embodiment of all knowledge, and no wonder, the concepts advanced for the solution of the problem of creation as revealed in the last phase of the Vedic thinking, i.e., the upaniṣads have ensured an honourable as well as lasting place for themselves in the philosophical treasure of mankind.

CHAPTER - IV

The Nyāyavaiśesika

I. Background

It is well-known that a powerful attack[1] on the hitherto unquestioned theistic ideals and dogmas by the nāstika (heretical) Bauddhas, Jainas and Lokayatas led the traditional orthodox scholars to systematise, rearrange and safeguard the truth and greater authority of the Veda, Smṛti etcetera on the one hand and the concepts of God, Souls, Elements, knowledge etcetera as prevailing in society till then, on the other. Reasoning henceforth took the place of faith and intution in the domain of philosophical enquiry; the authority of the scripture or the evidence of the senses was subjected to a critical and objective test, as the etymology of the term ānvīkṣikī[2] suggests. This (ānvīkṣikī) was called Nyāya and the system aimed

---

1. History of Indian Philosophy by U. Mishra, Vol.I pp.499-501.
2. Nyāyabhāṣya 1.1.1.

at championing the authenticity and unassailability of the beliefs and concepts of the traditional as well as of the commonsense views prevalent in society through the ages. Thus, Vācaspati defines the purpose of Nyāyaśāstra to be a critical examination of objects by means of specific well-frounded cannons of logical proof. This very approach is found in the minute and almost complete analysis and categorisation of the physical aspects of the universe in the Vaiśeṣika, a complementary (or like-minded) system.

II. Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika form one School

Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika[1] are called different systems only due to the greater emphasis that the Nyāya lays on the necessary means of right cognition (pramāṇa), argumentation (anumāna) and discussion (vāda) and the Vaiśeṣika on a comprehensive analysis of all the

1. Conception of Matter according to Nyāyavaiśeṣika by U. Mishra, pp.37-50.

categories of subtle and gross existences in the universe (which again are taken for granted under the lone head of the knowable or "prameya" in the Nyāya) But the fundamental similarity of commonsense approach[1] to the nature of the conscious as well as inert forms of matter characterizes the close affinity between these two allied systems. This is why various well-known votaries of these two originally different systems later on came to recognise the utility and compatibility of one for the other in their expositions. Thus, the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school is commonly and correctly recognised as integrally forming one school of Indian Philosophy.

---

1. "The joint system .....deals with all the forms of gross matter in the most natural way so as to satisfy the commonsense of man and be in agreement with the actual reality and the conventions of the external world (vyavahāra and pratiti). But at the same time it talks of paramanus and dvyanukas also which shows that the system deals even those forms of matter which are beyond the scope of common sense view." Ibid. p.52

III. The Uncreated Substances of the Universe

The Nyāyavaiśeṣika believes that the objective world and its multifarious experiences are concerned with both the eternal as well as the non-eternal substances.[1] The former group consists of the five atomic elements viz., earth (prithvī), water (āpas), air (vāyu), fire or heat (tejas) and the internal organ or mind (manas) as well as, the four ubiquitous ones viz., ether (ākāśa), time (kāla), space (dik) and the soul (ātman). These nine eternal[2] substances are the foundation or the ultimate cause of all products or aggregate effects (in other words all creation) in the universe and are not effects or created objects as such.

---

1. These, however, form only one of the seven categories of reality or predicable existence as propounded in this school.
2. Eternal means existing and uncaused. Vaiśeṣika-sūtra 4.1.1.

IV. The Non-Eternal Substances And The Atomic Theory Involved in Their Production

The gross objects or products of the world of common experience (e.g., jar, tree, etcetera) are infinitesimal and hence capable of movements, and are distinguished by the differerence in their component substances having different attributes etcetera. These are divisible ultimately to the atoms.

We can now examine how an ordinary lump of earth for example can be said to be created from atoms (paramāṇus), which are both collectively and individually imperceptible[1] and hence can not produce anything by themselves, (otherwise, a chain of production one after the other would make them appear as non-eternal and as having parts like the composite

---

1. Concept of Matter, f.n. 14 on p. 66. But, they are perceptible to yogins. Vaiśeṣika Upaskāra 8.1.2.

(avayavin) and, therefore, finite (mūrta) lump of earth (mṛtpiṇḍa) etcetera. But they are the ultimate material causes(and, hence indivisible any further[1]) of the various perceptible products. Adṛṣṭa and Divine Will (which we shall discuss later on) as instrumental or remote causal factors produce motion in individual paramāṇus which then cluster together in twos and form the dvyaṇukas. The two paramāṇus of earth etcetera are material causes of earthly dvyaṇukas etcetera respectively while their combination (saṁyoga) acts as the non-material cause. When three dvyaṇukas being moved

---

1. This is based on the experience that all gross products or substances are composed of several smaller parts. Nyāyavārttika 4.1.21.; These atoms are declared to be without extension in space, or else, being composite they could not be permanent. No Naiyāyika has yet tried to show how two objects devoid of extension can combine. This weakness of the school is fully exploited by Śaṁkarācārya in his refutation of the atomic theory Vi. Śāṁkara Bhāṣya 2.2.12-17.

(as in the case of the paramāṇus earlier), again, combine together they produce the trasareṇus of the class of earth etc. Four trasareṇus likewise, produce caturaṇukas and soon and so forth till the final product (antyāvayavin), in the present case the lump of earth, comes to exist or is created. By the way we can note how the same lump of earth is changed into a jar by the moving wheel, stick, and the pot maker who act as instrumental causes.

This process of atomic creation or production is common to all the physical products whether earthly (pārthiva), airy (vāyavīya) fiery (āgneya) or watery (jalīya).[1]

This explains the creative process or causal operation in the case of the non-eternal substances, which are generally classified as (1) finite organisms[2] (bhogāyatana or śarīra), (2) the sense organs[3]

1. Ākāśa has no parts or paramāṇus and hence is never produced or caused.

2. All products or non-eternal objects exist within the limitations of time and space and the ātman is all pervading, hence, the need for the latter to assume the limitation (or upādhi) of the physical organism where alone consciousness, desire, pleasure etc. can be produced through the ātman-manas combination.

3. These are created out of the five 'bhūtas' or

(indriyas) (both of these are necessary for psychic productions like pleasure, pain, desire, effort in the (ātman), and (3) the gross objects like the jar, the tree etcetera – known as viṣayas or objects of perception.

V. Motion[1] And Its Role In Creation (Both Physical And Psychic)

Although motion is not independent like substance in which it must inhere before it comes to exist, the production of the various objects of the universe like the tree, jar etcetera from the four types of atoms as mentioned above in the physical sphere as well as that of the products like knowledge, effort, pleasure etc. in the psychic sphere are possible respectively, in the former case, by the bringing about of conjunction between paramāṇus caused by motion, and in the latter case, by the presence

---

elements respectively. Nyāyasūtra 1.1.12 and Bhāṣya on it.

1. Motion is caused in the substances having limited form (i.e. the मूर्तद्रव्य) Cf. Praśastapādabhāṣya (with sūkti, setu and vyomavatī) p.290; Vaiśeṣika Upaskāra 2.1.21) by weight (cf. Vai. Sūtra 1.1.29), effort (cf. ibid), conjunction (cf. ibid) either due to forcible contact (cf. ibid 5.1.3) or by impulsion (cf. ibid 5.1.10), fluidity (cf. Pr. Pā. Bhā. p.290), unseen force (cf. Vai. Sū. 5.1.15. For example, the motion of the needle towards the magnet is attributed to adṛṣṭa), and impression (cf. Pr. Pā. Bhā. pp.633-34).

of motion in minds, causing their conjunction with the souls.[1]

In other words, no creation or production of the everyday-being-witnessed and continuously changing objects and experiences is possible without motion, the eternal substances being indivisible, distinct and unmoved by themselfes. That even in the beginningless cyclic universal creation and dissolution motion of corresponding high magnitude must be involved is self-evident.

<u>VI. Non-Eternal Qualities of Earthly Objects and The Process of Chemical Action Involved In Their Production.</u>

The airy atoms possess touch, the firy atoms possess also colour and the watery atoms possess taste as well besides taste and touch. These qualities are all eternal and are not produced due to chemical action as such.[2] But the earthly atoms possess

---

1. Nyāyasūtra and Bhāṣya 1.1.16; 1.1.4; <u>Conception of Matter</u> p.196; Vaiśeṣika Sūtra 5.2.23.
2. See (with references as under) ~~f.n. 44-48~~ ~~on~~ pp.74-75 of <u>Conception of Matter</u> ~~by U. Mishra~~.

qualities of colour, taste, smell and touch which are all non-eternal[1], for, these are produced or manifested and remain changing due to the application of heat through the process of chemical action (pākaja-prakriyā)[2].

Chemical action (pāka) is a kind of conjunction of the fiery or taijasa elements (atoms) with the earthly atoms by which the previous colour, taste, smell and touch are destroyed and new colour etc. are produced in their place. For example, a green mango fruit (an earthly object) assumes another yellow colour due to the taijasa conjunction. Although[3], every quality at every stage of the earthly object is produced by the process of chemical action, yet, the above example takes into account only one particular stage. It is, thus, well-known how green bananas or mangoes get ripened by a strong application of heat and come to possess entirely new and welcome colour, taste, smell and touch required for ready meals to guests im-

1. See f.n. 40 on page 74 of Ibid.
2. See f.n. 41 on Ibid.
3. See f.n. 54 on p. 17 of Ibid.

is a matter of hours, and not weeks which is ordinarily the case. The human body, the tree, the milk etc. keep on changing in respect of these qualities due to the chemical action.

Fiery atoms (taijasa paramāṇus) produce motion in the ultimate constituents of an earthly object through their forcible contact[1] (abhighāta) or impulsion[2] (nodana). This motion produces disjunctions which step by step destroy the conjunctions existing between the different constituents (or avayavas – from the kapālas or halves onwards of the raw jar being treated with heat, for example) of the composite and finally reduces them to their ultimate particles (i.e. the material causes – the atoms). Next, the former qualities of the earthly object are destroyed by a fresh fire contact (taijasa saṃyoga). Consequently, there is yet another fresh similar contact of taijasa which finally produces new qualities or attributes in place of the old ones. These

---

1. Cf. ft.note 52 on p.77 of Concept of Matter.
2. Cf. ft.note 53 on ~~page 77, Ibid.~~ ibid.

qualities are thus rightly called as 'heat-born' or pākaja. The earthen jar, in this way, when subjected to heat effect by the pot-maker assumes the red colour in the place of the former yellowish or blackish white colour.

This process of chemical action has been variously described to take from eleven to six moments[1] as a time-limit according to different scholars but the basic process remains unaltered.[2] For example, the acceptance or disbelief in vibhāgajavibhāga (the fact of one disjunction causing another) obliges the former to propound the time-limit of eleven moments and the latter to apportion nine moments (or time-units) only as necessary for the process of chemical action.

That chemical action takes place in earthly substances or objects was agreed to by both the

---

1. Ibid. ft.note 71 on page 84.

2. For these different views see pp.84-92 of Ibid.

Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas, but they differ in the details of it. Thus, the Vaiśeṣikas believe that it takes place in the paramāṇus[1] as it is only then that the final product can have the same attributes that actually belong to its ultimate interest material causes.[2] But the Naiyāyikas believe that the tejas contact takes place in the very composite.[3]

The importance and acceptance of the Vaiśeṣika pīlupāka as the standard Nyāyavaiśeṣika view point is to prove that attributes like consciousness, pleasure etc. cannot inhere in earth and other bhūtas, because, the abovementioned attributes (or qualities) do not eternally pervade the whole substance (i.e. are not yāvaddravyabhāvins, for, these are not produced in the eternal and ubiquitous

---

1. Cf. the designation of पैलुपाकवादिन् for them.
2. Cf. The Concept of 'Kāraṇaguṇāḥ Kāryaguṇān Samārabhante' in Tarkabhāṣā (Chowkhamba San. 1963) by Keśavamiśra, p. 18.
3. Cf. that of पिठरपाकवादिन् for them.

souls within the limitations of time and space), whereas, the attributes of the earthly composites (or non-eternal products) inhere in them only as long as they themselves exist. That the attributes of an earthly object inhere in all the constituents - right to the ultimate ones - can be demonstrated only when we reduce them to its paramāṇus.[1]

VII. Non-Being and Creation

Non-being has also[2] been accepted as a separate category of reality which is experienced and can be explained from the view point of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika. Of the various non-beings (abhāvas) only prāgabhāva and pradhvaṁsābhāva, antecedents and consequents

---

1. Ft. note 85 on p.92 of Concept of Matter.

2. Udayanācārya was the first to declare it as the seventh category of reality.

(or resultants) to every creation or production (which is invariably transient or non-eternal) and to every dissolution and extinction respectively, are relevant to our understanding of the theory of creation as propounded by the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school.

VIII. Creation And The Nyāyavaiśeṣika Concept of Causality or Ārambha

All objects and phenomena in the physical or psychic universe are governed by the theory of causation. In other words, all that appears new or has come to exist must be an effect of some prior causal factors. Nothing in the world of common experience can reasonably be explained to have come into being or to have been created or produced unless we accept the fact that there were some antecedent factors or causes for the products or

aggregate effects. The different objects of experience have thus their beginning or creation (ārambha) in the background of their causes.

Thus the concept of causality is of central importance in the theory of creation as advanced in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika.

Nyāyavaiśeṣika believes in the eternal atoms of fire, earth, water and air as the ultimate material causes of all physical objects in the universe. These atoms of which all effects or things (kāryas) are composed of do not change. In this respect the atoms are comparable to the pradhāna of Sāṁkhya. But, then, according to them the effect or product is something new being formerly (i.e., prior to the causal operation or creation) non-existent (asat) and in this respect their concept of cause and effect can be compared to the doctrine of momentary change (kṣaṇabhaṁgavāda) of the Buddhists. Because kārya is described as asat in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika their

concept of causality is often known as asatkāryavāda.

Thus, the Nyāyavaiśeṣika believes in the permanence and eternity of the material cause of creation the ultimate atoms remaining the same before, during and after the causal operation or the process of the origination of the effect. But a new effect can come to exist according to this concept only after the evanescence of the proximate material cause.[1] Curds, for example, are produced only after the destruction of the milk by a rearrangement of the component atoms.[2]

Then, the new effect has an absolute difference (atyantabheda)[3] as compared to its material cause.

---

1. Nyāyasūtra 4.1.14.

2. Nyā.Sū.3.2.16, Nyāya Bhāṣya 4.1.18.

3. Of course, this is reasonably qualified by the adjective 'abheda sahiṣṇu', for, the effect paṭa cannot but invariably be produced from its material or inherent causes the tantus only without whose existence its own existence cannot be sustained. Cf. the concept of ayutasiddha referred to ~~in Sec.VIII above.~~ on p. 132.

The new composite effect, for example a piece of cloth is altogether different[1] from its proximate material causes, the threads. Thus, the whole cloth is different from its component parts viz. the threads, the wholesome varigated colour (citravarṇa) is quite different from the various colours that compose it.[2] Hence, according to this concept of causality material cause alone is inadequate to explain completely the emergence or production of the new effect.

The Nyāyavaiśeṣika, therefore, also postulates non-material and efficient or operative causes to fully account for the knowledge and usage of distinction (bhedapratīti and bhedavyavahāra) between the material or primary cause and the effect. Strikingly enough Sāṁkhya fails to establish any difference between cause and effect, which is at the root of

---

1. Nyāya Sūtra 2.1.30.
2. Nyā. Vārttika 2.1.36-37 and Tātparyaṭīkā on ibid.

the concept of causality according to the common sense point of view.

The cause (kāraṇa) has been technically defined as that which invariably and necessarily precedes the effect (karyaniyatapūrvavṛttiḥ) excluding all that do not directly contribute to the resultant effect (ananyathāsiddhatvam). For example, the lump of clay, the moving wheel, the stick, the potmaker, the conjunction of the halves (kāpālas) etcetera that invariably and necessarily precede the production of the effect (viz., the ghaṭa) are its causes. But the donkey on which incidentally the clay was brought to the place of the pot maker is anyathāsiddha as the same act could have been performed by the means of a bullock-cart, a coolie etc. as well.

The causes of an effect have been divided into

three types in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika. The inherent cause (samavāyi kāraṇa) is that in which the effect comes to exist and is produced by the relationship of inherence[1] (samavāya).

By the way, it may not be out of place to note that samavāya is a special relationship that exists between the part and the whole (avayavāvayavī), between the generality and the individual (jātivyakti), between action and the actor or the moved (kriyākriyāvantau), between an attribute or quality and the qualified or the possessor of the attribute (guṇaguṇinau), and between an particularity and the eternal substances. The 'part' etcetera respectively are invariably dependent for their existence on the 'whole' etcetera respectively at all times except when the latter get destroyed. Thus, for example, according to Nyāyavaiśeṣika, a piece of cloth comes to exist in the threads which are its inherent cause

---

1. See section VIII above.

and subtraction. The lump of clay (mṛtpiṇḍa), in this way, is the inherent cause of the jar (ghaṭa).

The second type of kāraṇa is the non-inherent cause (asamavāyi kāraṇa) which together with the effect inheres in either the inherent cause or the inherent cause of that 'inherent cause.' Thus, the conjunction of threads inhering in the threads (i.e., the inherent cause of cloth) together with the cloth is the non-inherent cause of the effect 'cloth'. Similarly, 'the colour of the threads' can also be explained as the non-inherent cause of 'the colour of the cloth', the inherent cause of the inherent cause are the threads in which the colour of the threads exists by the relationship of inherence.

The remaining causes which fulfill the general conditions of being a cause as discussed earlier and do not come under the above two types of causes, are all termed as efficient cause (nimitta kāraṇa). The weaver and the potmaker are the efficient causes of the

effects, viz., the piece of cloth and the jar respectively.

IX. Universal Dissolution and Creation and the Roles of God and Law Of Karman or Unseen Force Therein

According to the Nyāyavaiśesika view the world of objects and experiences as the souls (jīvas or ātmans) have been knowing, is beginningless, although there is a continuous cycle of creation and dissolution (sṛṣṭi and pralaya) following each other in succession after a fixed duration. By the way, it may be stated that this theory interestingly enough, is peculiarly supported by the beliefs of the common man and has been exuberantly developed in the Purāṇa and Smṛti literature and draws great traditional sanctity from its Vedic origin.

A) Īśvara

Also, however, it was reasonably argued by the Nyāyavaiśesika theorists, the Universal creation and

dissolution on such a big scale cannot be explained or accounted for by the operation of the cummulative adṛṣṭa of the jivas and the inhert atoms which are imparted motion by it for different products, alone. Therefore, the acceptance of Īśvara (God), an active and conscious agent, Who is supposed to have independent knowledge and will and Who is free from the necessity of assuming an organism and sense-organs (including the mind) of His own - became imperative. The jīvātman possesses demerit, nescience, carelessness;[1] remains in bondage and gets liberated. But, the Īśvara is free from all this. On the contrary, He possesses the eight-fold aiśvaryas (aṇiman etcetera) In fact, the infinite number of souls depend for their knowledge, desire, effort etcetera on the limitations of

---

1. Nyā Bhā. 4.1.21.

prārabdha or adṛṣṭa, time and space, and the external sense - organs, the particular minds and the external objects or created products (viṣayas).

In other words, Īśvara, as described above, helps us explain the facts of pre-phenomenal stage when the entire familiar created universe - so very vast and varied as well as full of the charming certainties and complexes, is yet to come into being. The created universe, as it were, is a vast mechanical product - wherein the eternal nine substances are the material causes, motion etcetera imparted into them are the non-material causes and the creator God is the great conscious Agent presiding over the just and smooth periodic phenomenon of universal creation and dissolution as its efficient cause. This type of image is familiar to the commonsense viewpoint,* when we find the building of a huge bridge, house or even a small earthen pot in the process of actual production.

(B) Adṛṣṭa

But Īśvara is not a blind force and the sole

efficient cause of the cyclic creation and dissolution of the universe according to the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school. The law of karman (often referred to as divine justice or daivī cakra) or the unseen force which the orthodox Indians have traditionally upheld as supreme in all walks of life and in all corners of the universe - is accepted by the Nyāyavaiśeṣika also. Accordingly the mental impression (bhāvanā) of all activities cause merit and demerit (dharma and adharma[1]) both of which inhere in the mind which accompanies each soul even at the time of death. This unseen force (adṛṣṭa or prārabdha[2]) expedites or causes the individual soul to experience suitable retribution in the shape of pleasure or pain (sukha and duḥkha). It also motivates or determines the time, place and the organism etcetera as suited to them in each case. Thus the ripe time,

---

1. Adṛṣṭa or unseen force in Vaiśeṣika is the same as the dharma and adharma (merit and demerit) of Nyāya.

~~2. Ibid.~~

places, models and forms of creation, in all its details, after the cyclic period of dissolution are determined or guided by the adrsta alone and the Isvara not only takes cognizance of it but fully respects it at the time of each creation. We may even compare Isvara with the driver of an express train and the adrsta with the railway track along which alone the journey of universal creation and dissolution, comparable to its running and stoppage at necessary and regular intervals, take place. These individual adrstas of the souls may, therefore, be understood by us as active principles governing and guiding the movement of the atoms, the ultimate material causes of the universal creation.

C. Pralaya

It is held on the lines of the Vedik 'dhātā yathāpūrvamakalpayat' that after the end of one hundred years of Brahmā (whose one ahorātra is equal to one year of human beings) the time is ripe for His relief or respite. Then God or Mahesvara, i.e. a 'Lord of the

whole universe', has a desire in his mind to destroy all products including those in the form of ceaseless and tiresome, rebirths (creation and dissolution of bodies after and before death) for the living beings (i.e. the souls or jīvas). This need for rest for the souls has been likened to the popular reflection of a man tired with work and experience (viz., the psychic products like effort, desire, pleasure and pain etc.) during the long day needing a full nights rest subsequently.

This desire of the Maheśvara prevents or causes to come to a standstill, the normal functioning of modes (vṛttis) of the adṛṣṭas of the jīvas which, during the creation period cause the production and existence of organisms, sense-organs, physical substances and the psychic experiences.

Consequently, motions are produced from the conjunctions belonging to the ātmans and the paramāṇus helped by the Divine Will, which in turn produce

disjunctions between the ultimate atoms leading to the destruction of the previous conjunctions existing between them, which had earlier helped in the production of the composite effects like the suitable organisms etc. during the process of creation.

In this way, every product including the invisible dvyaṇukas and the gross elements (mahābhūtas) is destroyed and only the ultimate atoms and the other eternal substances including the numerous ātmans together with merit and demerit (i.e. adṛṣṭa) exist afterwards. Even the heat-born attributes of colour and the rest exist in the form of limitations (upādhis) of Kāla or time. The motions produced by the velocity (vega) generated by the destruction of diverse physical products as well as prior non-being (prāgabhāva) of future creations exist during this period of dissolution for one hundred Brāhma (i.e. the creator's) years.

All this, however, is about avāntara pralaya or Khaṇḍapralaya, in which, only the non-eternal products (anityakāryas) are destroyed. There is also mentioned by some scholars a mahāpralaya or total dissolution in

which all substance or positive products are fully destroyed and after this there is no creation. But, largely perhaps owing to its difficult and inconvenient apprehension by the common man, this mahāpralaya is not the immediate or even destinctive concern of the general theory of creation and dissolution as propounded in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school. We may, therefore, conclude that the cycle of universal creation and dissolution, too, is both beginningless and endless.

D. Sṛṣṭi

After the period of dissolution or Cosmic Rest the cummulative adṛṣṭa of the souls (jīvas) comes to operate through the Divine Will for the creation of beings and objects suited to their requirements for the purpose of experiencing pleasure and pain as fruits of their past deeds (karmans). Then the conjunctions are produced between the ātmans and the paramāṇus, which, in turn produce motion in the air atoms which, again, join together as dvyaṇuka and so on ending at last in the final (mahān) air (vāyu) which remains vibrating in the space. It possesses continuous strong vibration because of intense velocity and

due to its (being the first product) having no obstacles in its movement. Later on, a big reservoir of water from the water atoms through the usual process, is produced in the mahān vāyu the latter acting as its substratum due to its being an obstacle of weight on account of the velocity and touch that it possesses. The waters remain flowing through the air's velocity. After this, in the like manner is produced the big earth in a solid form from its paramāṇus. In those very waters (jalarāśi) a big heap of tejasa out of five atoms is produced.

After the four mahābhūtas have been created one after the other the same Divine Will (Saṁkalpa of maheśvara) causes a cosmic egg (brahmāṇḍa) to be produced out of the fire and earth atoms, in which the legendary caturmukha Brahmā or the 'great grand-father' of the entire creation is produced together with all the lokas (regions or planets). This

Brahmā is engaged in the full-fledged production of living beings by the Divine Will. He has extraordinary powers, intellect, dispassion, knowledge of the time of the fructification of the beings' past karmans and createś from his mind Prajāpatis, Manus, several groups of gods, ṛṣis and Pitṛs. These are called ayonija, being mental products only. Next are born the four castes and other beings of low grade from his mouth, arms, thigh and feet. The beings or jīvas are connected with adequate(due i.e. the deserved) degree of dharma (righteousness), jñāna (knowledge), vairāgya (detachment) and aiśvarya (extraordinary powers) on the one hand and that of adharma, ajñāna, avairāgya and anaiśvarya together with their inescapable results viz., pleasure, pain, mental impression, desire, effort etcetera on the other.

3. The Aim of Creation

After all that we have known and critically

discussed about the theory of creation so far in this chapter there arises a natural desire to know why should there be any creation at all ? The cause or purpose is stated thus by the traditional Nyāyavaiśeṣikas. Living beings are always thinking, desiring and doing deeds.[1] The impressions of these remains in same form and unseen (hence called adṛṣṭa) till the time of their fructification. We may compare this phenomena with the reaping of the harvest produced out of the seeds at a suitable time. Concept of cause and effect as discussed earlier, the divine or poetic justice for misdeeds and good deeds — which forms the basis of the morality and code of ordinary human conduct, and, the need to accept individual living beings as themselves responsible for all the pleasure and pain experiences during his present life-time and afterwards — together present an unescapable picture before the commonsense view point of the society in general and Nyāyavaiśeṣika in particular, so that they

come to have full belief in all the implications of the theory of Karman as detailed above.

Hence, the aim of all creation is to make possible the due experience (or bhoga) of pleasure and pain in accordance with the soul's individual past thoughts, desires and deeds, and, in this way, the creation of the objects, the organisms etcetera also affords a hope for them eventually to attain to the highest well-being or freedom from pains - which, however, is not the direct aim of creation. But, strictly moral, disciplinarian and equitable treatment for all the living beings so that, they may make reasonable progress on the path of righteousness leading to happiness is perhaps the most laudable characterstic of the aim of creation according to the Nyāyavaiśeṣika

XI. Conclusion

We have so far been critically evaluating the

various aspects and factors responsible for creation in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school. All said and understood, a few striking general characterstics may carefully be noted by way of conclusion of this study:

(a) Creation according to the Nyāyavaiśeṣika is a continuing process for explaining all change or newness that occurs at any time and place both in the physical as well as the psychic world.

(b) Intellectual soundness and an exhaustively analytical attitude are widely evidenced in the treatment of the complex problem of creation according to the Nyāyavaiśeṣika. The high place accorded to reasoning (tarka) and the knowledge of the positive categories of reality by methods of comparision (showing both sādharmya and vaidharmya) between one and the rest in each case are specially remarkable in this respect.

(c) Conformity to the commonsense point of view with regard to the forms of reality of both gross and minute objects, as well as with regard to the

usually accepted concepts of jīva, īśvara, adṛṣṭa etcetera, to a large extent, have made the Nyāyavaiśeṣika theory of creation more popular than that of any other orthodox school of Indian Philosophy. This sensitiveness for common beliefs, duly tempered with caution and critical acumen, makes this theory greatly intelligible (as opposed to an abstraction) to most enquirers of truth.

(d) The characterstic of pluralistic realism in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika forms an important background to the total understanding of its theory of creation in a proper perspective. Realism is amply reflected in the school's firm belief in the independent entity of all forms of reality or predicable existence which do not depend either on the cognising mind or on their cognition itself for their existence. The element of pluralism is borne out by the emphasis laid on particularities; the plurality of the souls deduced on the basis of the difference of birth, activity, knowledge etcetera of so many conscious

beings is notable in this respect.

(e) That the world of conscious living beings and inert physical objects is a moral stage for the uplift, movement and intimate governance of the individual souls - has been clearly visualised in the aim of creation as propounded by the Nyāyavaiśeṣika.

(f) Matter and spirit, the latter consisting of souls having limited consciousness and God 'the supreme Lord of the universe,' have been properly and significantly distinguished and assigned important roles in the theory of creation according to this school.

CHAPTER - V

The Sāṁkhyayoga

I. General Background

The view point of Sāṁkhyayoga is mainly intellectual or conceptual based on perceptions or realizations of a highly sopisticated and advanced meditation. It propounds and deals at length with the one ultimate unmanifest principle and then its evolutes from Mahat (intellect) to tanmātras (the elements 'alone', i.e. in subtle form), all of them imperceptible and practically unrealisable for the beginner or common enquirer of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika stage. The gross elements earth etcetera are referred to at the end and what is more said as incapable of having any or causing any further effects (tattvāntara).

Whatever creation or evolution takes place, we can surmise, therefore, is not at the gross physical level whose realities are neither denied nor are the

immediate purpose of investigation according to this school, but at the mental and even supramental level. The so called Sāṁkhya School proves these facts theoretically (i.e. through a superficial or hypothetical knowledge) and the so-called Yoga demonstrates their functions practically and makes realization of the ultimate goal possible (through true knowledge).

Knowledge and its realization go hand in hand with each other and are complementary in all the main schools of orthodox Indian Philosophy. One cannot have true knowledge (i.e. full conviction of and insight into facts - things or phenomena) of such objects entired as described above by merely talking and by having indirect assertion through mundane reasonings.

It is simply for this reason that the samkhya and the yoga integrally form one school and the path or vision of reality they shew to the enquirer is also one.[1]

---

1. साङ्ख्ययोगौ पृथग्बालाः प्रवदन्ति न मनीषिणः ।
एकमप्यास्थितः सम्यगुभयोर्विन्दते फलम् ।।
यत्साङ्ख्यैः प्राप्यते स्थानं तद्योगैरपि गम्यते ।
एकं साङ्ख्यं च योगं च यः पश्यति स पश्यति ।।

Bhagawadgītā 5.4/5.

II. The Prominence of 'Creation' in the Sāṁkhyayoga School

All the twentyfive well-known principles (tattvas) of the universe have been classified mainly into four categories based on their respective causal and productive efficiency, viz., (1) that is creative, (2) that is creative and created, (3) that is created, and (4) that is neither created nor creative. This division explicitly distinguishes the importance that the Sāṁkhyayoga exponents attach to the theory of production or creation as a whole. Thus, it is said that Primordial Matter or Nature, the root cause of all created objects, is not produced; the Great Principle (intellect or Buddhi) and the rest are seven, being both the producer and produced; the sixteen are the produced; and the spirit is neither the producer nor the produced.[1]

---

1. मूलप्रकृतिरविकृतिर्महदाद्याः प्रकृतिविकृतयः सप्त ।
   षोडशकस्तु विकारो न प्रकृतिर्न विकृतिः पुरुषः ॥
   Sāṁkhyakārikā 3.

III. The Concept of Casuality – (Pariṇāma)

Creation or production of the different objects of the universe presupposes the concept of and relation between cause and effect in Indian Philsophy. As such Sāṃkhyayoga believes in effect (pariṇāma) or modification (vikāra). The process and nature of creation in this school, therefore, can be evaluated in the right perspective only after a clear understanding of its concept of causality.

According to this concept, the effect essentially exists in the cause even before the former's evolution or gross appearance. In other words, the effect is an entity even prior to the operation of the cause. Five arguments are adduced for this assertion.[1]

(i) A non-entity can never be brought into existance:

If the effect were a non-entity before the causal operation it could never be brought into existence by

---

1. असदकरणादुपादानग्रहणात् सर्वसंभवाभावात् ।
शक्तस्य शक्यकरणात् कारणभावाच्च सत्कार्यम् ॥
Sāṃkhyakārikā and Tattvakaumudī thereon.

anyone, just as even a thousand artists cannot turn blue into yellow. Also non-entity (asattā) and entity (sattā) both cannot be supposed as properties of the effect because such an effect (or qualified object) being non-existent, no property could belong to it, let alone that of entity. Besides, it is unreasonable to accept non-entity belonging to the effect (as a property) when it is neither related (sambaddha) nor cognate (tadātmaka) to it. Hence the effect subsists both before and after the causal operation.

The sole function of the cause, therefore, remains to manifest or unfold the pre-existing effect. That such a manifestation of something exists beforehand is a fact of common experience and occurrence, as that of the oil from sesamum by pressure, of rice from paddy by thumping and of milk from cows by milking. On the other hand, a non-entity, just as the

horns of a hare is never seen to be either manifested or produced.

(2) There is a determinate relation between the material cause ~~with~~ and the effect: The effect subsists and is produced because of the relation holding between itself and its material causes. That is to say, the cause produces the effect when in relation with it (and not otherwise). For example, the jar is produced out of lump of clay because it was and is related to it. In this context, it becomes evident that no relationship with a non-existing effect is possible. Hence the effect must have an entity prior to its manifestation or production.

(3) Every effect cannot be possible from every cause: If it is argued that the effect is produced by the particular cause while unconnected with it, then, every effect would be justified by every cause without restriction. But, such is not the case. The sands, for example, do not produce oil while only the sesamum

does. Hence a connected cause alone can produce a connected effect and not an unconnected cause an unconnected effect. "There is no relation of the cause imbued with entity - with non-entity; those holding the production of an unconnected effect will land themselves in a regressus ad infinitum."[1]

(4) A competent cause produces only that effect for which it is competent: Even if no relationship between cause and effect is accepted, the opponent (i.e. the asatkāryavādin) may argue, there is a capability or competency (śakti) in the cause (e.g. milk) to produce the particular effect (say 'curd') and thus, only a particular effect (and not all sorts of effects as pointed to in (3) above) is produced from the cause. Now, the Sāmkhyayoga refutes the above objection in the following manner: does this capability belonging to the cause apply to every effect or only to those for which the cause is capable ?

If the former, then the same confusion (see (3) above) arises; if the latter, how does the capability (or causal energy) apply to non-entity.

On this point the opponent may assert afresh that the causal energy is itself (naturally) so constituted so as to produce only certain effects and not others.

The Sāmkhyayoga again asks if this peculiarly constituted energy (śakti) is connected with the particular effect or not. In case the answer is in the afirmative, no relationship being possible with non-entity the effect must be an entity; in the latter case there is the same endless series of causes and effects. Hence, the effect is an entity even before it is produced.

<u>(5) The effect is non-different from the cause:</u>

The non-difference between cause and effect in general and the threads and the cloth, for example, in particular, has been established, by a process of

negative inference (śeṣavat or avītānumāna) in the following proofs: The cloth (an effect) and the threads (the material)cause do not differ in essence. The cloth inheres in the threads that constitute it, while the essentially different objects, i.e. the cow and horse do not inhere in each other. They (essentially different objects, e.g. the jar and the cloth) are not related as cause and effect. But between the cloth and the threads we find the causal relation subsisting. Hence,the cause and effect cannot differ from one another in essence. Then, neither junction taking place between essentially different objects, e.g. between a table and a book nor non-contiguity also found between two essentially different objects, e.g. between Vindhya and the Himālaya - are conspicuously non-existent between the cause and the effect, (the threads and the cloth in this instance),[1] and object different in essence

---

1. (i) Cf. Sāṁkhyatattvakaumudī on Kārikā 9.
(ii) According to Vāchaspati, [illegible] इति तन्तुभ्यो न भिद्यते, गुरुत्वान्तरकार्याग्रहणात्। [illegible] यद्यस्माद्भिन्नं तस्मात् तस्य गुरुत्वान्तरं कार्यं गृह्यते यथैकपलिकस्य स्वस्तिकस्य

यो गुरुत्वकार्यावनतिविशेषस्तस्माद्द्वयोरेकस्य स्थानेऽन्यस्य गुरुत्वकार्यावनतिभेदो लोके।
न च तथा तन्तुगुरुत्वकार्यात् पटगुरुत्वकार्यान्तरं कृत्स्नेन दृश्यते। तस्मादभिन्नस्तन्तुभ्यः
पट इति। Ibid, The ground of Tattvakau. may, perhaps, be contradicted; cf. Yājñavalkyasmṛti 2.179 according to which coarse wool and cotton yarn gain 10 p.c. in weight in weaving; wool and cotton yarn of middling counts gain 5 p.c those of the finer counts gain 3 p.c. Again, we may hold that the ground expounded here is insufficient because, two different in weight causing thereby different levels of lowering of a balance. For example, the shopkeeper puts two essentially different objects viz., the 'iron piece' (say that representing a Kilo) and the heap of salt on either side of the balance and they are found to be equiweight or multi-weight as intended.

to be equi weight or multiweight as intended.

The difference between the cloth and the threads, however, may be supported on the following grounds - (1) When the cloth is destroyed or brought into existence we do not realize that the threads are destroyed or are produced and vice versa. (2) Different names are assigned to the cause and the effect in daily usage such as when we say that the 'cloth' exists, or is made out of 'threads', (3) The cloth is used for covering our body and thr threads for sewing etcetera, hence they are different.[1]

To these arguments the Sāmkhyayoga replies that. (1) Cause and effect being nom different as established earlier, both production (utpāda) and destruction (vināsa) which evidentally are two contradictory states or characterstics (viruddhadharmas)-

---

1. Cf. Tattwakaumudī on Kārikā 9 and Susama on 14.। स्वात्मनि क्रियानिरोधो बुद्धिव्यपदेशार्थक्रियाव्यवस्थाभेदाश्च नैकान्तिकं भेदं साधयितुमर्हन्ति ।

cannot be assigned in this instance. The appearance and disappearance of the effects (i.e. parinama or karya) in the one cause from which they evolve or arise and into which they dissolve may be compared to the limbs (i.e. hands and feet) of the tortoise, which again and again emerge from and enter into it. These limbs cannot be said to have been either produced or destroyed because they are ever present in the tortoise. In the same way the jar, the crown etc. which are only particular of clay, gold etcetera, on emanating from these latter, are said to be produced; and on entering into them again (i.e. being changed into clay etc.) they disappear and are as such said to be destroyed.

(2) Although the effect is non-different from its cause, yet the assertion of their relationship is based on conventionally accepted difference, e.g., when we say "the 'Tilaks' (i.e. the plants so named) are in the 'forest'" the tilakas and the forest comprising of them are essentially non-different.

(3) Also, the different purposes can be served

by one and the same substance, for example, the same fire burns, consumes, as well as, emits light. Hence, the earth and jar, the threads and cloth need not be supposed different for this reason. Thus, the effects (pariṇāmas) are only evolutions or modifications (āvirbhāva or vikāra) of their cause with which they are as opposed to dissolution or 'naturalisation' (i.e. tirobhāva or prakṛtabhāva) - essentially non-different.[1]

IV. The main kinds of Pariṇāma[2]

This pariṇāma or vikāra has been defined as the emergence or manifestation (āvirbhāva) of another characterstics or form (dharma) in the existing object (i.e., the dharmin) after the disappearances or vanishing (tirobhāva) of the former dharma.[3] In this

---

1. Cf. Bhagwadgitā 2.16; Chhāndogyopaniṣat वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् 6.1.4.

2. Yogasūtra 3.9 to 13 and Yogabhāṣya thereon.

3. अथकोऽयं परिणामः । अवस्थितस्य द्रव्यस्य पूर्वधर्मनिवृत्तौ धर्मान्तरोत्पत्तिः परिणाम इति।
Yogabhāṣya 3.13.

way manifestation or vyaktikarma of different forms or characterstics eternally existing in the unmanifest nature avyakta prakriti of an object is known as parinama in the Samkhyayoga school. Parinama can be of the intellect (mahat or buddhi), of the gross elements bhutas, as well as of the organs (indriyas).

However, the parinama has also been divided into the following three types:

(A) Dharmaparinama - The disappearance of the characteristics or modes (dharma or svabhavikavrtti) of great (i.e. worldly or multifarious) activity (vyutthana) and the rise or manifestation of that suppression or restraint (nirodha) in the intellect (citta or buddhi) is an effect (parinama) of characterstic or mode (dharma). Dharmin or Prakrti cause of object possession of unmanifest and the effects (parinama) such as cow, the jar etc. are its characterstics (dharma). Similarly, the 'seeing' (alochana) of blue etc. form is a dharmaparinama of the organ of eye.

(b) Laksanaparinama: The being or existence of a dharma in the forms of (i.e. during) the three times (lakshanas) of past (atita), present and future vartamana. Thus, the characterstic of great activity or that of suppression or restraint belonging to the intellect can be said to have three-fold laksanaparinama i.e. effect corresponding one of the three divisions of times. The dharmaparinamas ofthe gross elements as well as those of the organs such as have been referred to in (a) above, for example, also like wise have the laksanaparinama in the terms of atita, vartamana and anagata.

(c) Avasthaparinama - When the intellect manifests its characterstic of restraint or suppression of all activity the latter are prominent or powerful and the opposite characterstic of great (or manysided) activity remains subdued or weak. This 'having powerful' and 'having become weak' is the avastha parinama of the two dharmas (i.e. nirodha and vyutthana) respectively. Similarly, the cow in the present form (this is laksanaparinama of prithvi) may be new-born, adolascent,

of young or old age - these conditions whichever may apply in a particular case are avasthāpariṇāmas. The jar in the present form, likewise can have the manifestation of condition or avasthāpariṇāma of newness or oldness. The eye may in the present be conditioned by dimness or clearity which again illustrates avasthāpariṇāma.

All these manifestations or modifications qualify the object (dharmin) which does not give up its permanency or essential nature while in any mode, time or condition. For example, the earth is present in the jar when the latter is conditioned by the future, comes to belong to the present and passes into past time. Therefore, we may conclude that pariṇāma practically or commonly is only one type although it does appear.[1]

V. The Concept of the Unmanifest Avyakta and The Nature and Function of Attributes that Constitute It.

'From the finite nature of specific objects, from homogeneity, from evolution being due to active

---

1. एते धर्मलक्षणावस्थापरिणामा धर्मिस्वरूपमनतिक्रान्ता इत्येक एव परिणामः सर्वानमून् विशेषानभिप्लवते। Yogbhāṣya 3.13.

(causal) energy, from the separation of cause and effect, and from the undevidedness (resolution) of the whole universe the Unmanifest (avyakta) is the cause; it operates through the three attributes (guṇas) by belending and by modification as water, on account of the difference arising from the receptacle of the Attributes as they are variously demonstrated.'[1] The effect being only a developed or manifest state of the cause, in which it lies latent before and after its manifestation or gross appearance, all substances of the known universe must have their unmanifested condition in the causes. Now, if we go on increasing the series[2] from the grossest elements upwards to comparatively minute causal substances we would be landed in a regressus ad infinitum. In order to avoid this we must postulate the existence of a principle which

---

1. Dr.G.N.Jha's translation of the following:
भेदानां परिमाणात्समन्वयाच्छक्तितः प्रवृत्तेश्च । कारणकार्य विभागा-
द्वैश्वरूप्यस्य ।। कारणमस्त्यव्यक्तम् प्रवर्तते त्रिगुणतः समुदयाच्च ।
परिणामतः सलिलवत् प्रतिप्रतिगुणाश्रयविशेषात् ।।

Sāṃkhyakārikā 15-16 and Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī.

2. We shall discuss the order and process of evolution in Section ~~VII below~~.

should be both uncaused and the final substrate of the undeveloped state of all other substances. Thus, such a cause, being by its very nature the unmanifested or final one, is rightly termed avyakta or pradhāna.

The ultimate material cause is one which is ever changing or manifesting or evolving as so many effects in creation. The essential characterstics or the attributes also must necessarily be the same in both cause and effect.[1] It is in this context that the myriad objects of the evolved or manifest universe are termed vyakta or manifest, and the ultimate cause, having the same properties or attributes as the manifest or created world, as Principal or Unmanifest (pradhāna or avyakta). This creative activity has been assigned to one creative agent viz., the Unmanifest or Principal cause in this school. Regarding its composition it must be observed that like the evolution for manifestation of a tree from its tiny seed the manifest (vyakta) entities in their minute form are essentially present in a final

---

1. Cf. the theory of non-difference between the cause and the effect in section III earlier; also Cf. अविवेक्यादेः सिद्धः त्रैगुण्यात्तद्विपर्ययाभावात् । कारणगुणात्मकत्वात्कार्यस्याव्यक्तमपि सिद्धम्

S.Kā.14.

or last cause (mulaprakṛti). Again the manifest are many and transitory i.e., they appear and disappear, but their cause the Unmanifest is ever present during both evolution (āvirbhāva) and resolution (tirbhava) of the manifest realities. The Pradhana of Sāmkhyayoga is rightly termed as parinaminitya as opposed to Kutasthanitya, for its permanence is subject to constant change or evolution (nitya parināma).[1]

Before we can understand how the universal evolution proper takes place according to this school it may be interesting to note the points of difference[2]

---

1. The term प्रसवधर्मि in Sāmkhya Kārikā 11 and Tattwakaumudi thereon : [redacted] प्रसवरूपो धर्मो यः सोऽस्यास्तीति प्रसवधर्मि। प्रसवधर्मीति वक्तव्ये मत्वर्थीयप्रसवधर्मस्य नित्ययोगमाख्यातुम्। सरूपविरूप परिणामाभ्यां न कदाचिदपि वियुज्यत इत्यर्थः।

   प्रतिसर्गावस्थायां सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्च सदृशपरिणामानि भवन्ति। परिणामस्वभावा हि गुणा नापरिणम्य क्षणमप्यवतिष्ठन्ते। तस्मात् सत्त्वं सत्त्वरूपतया तमस्तमोरूपतया प्रतिसर्गावस्थायामपि प्रवर्तते।

   Sāmkhyatattwakaumudi on J.Ka 16.

2. हेतुमदनित्यमव्यापि सक्रियमनेकमाश्रितं ~~[illegible]~~ लिंगम्।
   सावयवं परतन्त्रं व्यक्तं, विपरीतमव्यक्तम्।।

   Sāmkhyakārikā 10 and Tattvakaumudi on it.

and similarities[1] between the effects of Pradhāna on the one hand and the Pradhāna itself on the other. The Manifested (i.e. the effects of Pradhāna or Vyakta) have a cause, are not-eternal i.e. destructible or revolving (returning to the condition of their material cause), not pervading or extending over all evolving or creative substances, active or mobile[2] multiform (since consciousness etcetera differ in each individual and also, for example, the earth has many shapes like those of the jar etcetera), dependent on the causes, characterstic or predicative of the unmanifest, conjunct i.e. composed of parts, and subordinate being in the need of the rootless unmanifest

---

1. त्रिगुणमविवेकि विषयः सामान्यमचेतनं प्रसवधर्मि ।
   व्यक्तं तथा प्रधानं तद्विपरीतं तथा पुमान् ।।

   Sāmkhyakārikā 11.

2. See f.n.2 on p.167. The Buddhi etcetera migrate to the new bodies leaving the previous ones. The mobility of earth is too well-known.

(Nature or Prakṛti) in the completion of the production of its effect. The Unmanifest is just the reverse — it is uncaused, eternal, pervading, immobile (being universal, though, it possesses the action of evolution or development of the phenomenal realities called the manifest), single, independent or self-sufficient, unconjunct being connate with all the evolutes or manifested objects and non-subservient (i.e. supreme). Now coming to the similarities between the unmanifest (prakṛti) and its effects (vikṛtis) they are both constituted by the same three attributes (guṇas), are indiscriminating, objective, generic (or common for several spirits or puruṣas), non-intelligent or insentient, and creative or prolific. These similarities, therefore, constitute the basic perception or nature of reality in the material objects of the universe, which are all evolved or manifested out of a final cause viz., the Unmanifest. We find that the different objects in the universe possess all these characteristics as detailed above.

But, the three attributes which are called the

essence or part and parcel, and, hence, giving a wholesome common identity to all these principles, (whether the cause Prakrti or the manifest, the effects)[1] are traditionally assigned paramount importance in the theory of creation according to this school. This is why, Prakrti or the creative principle as well as its vikrtis or the evolutes are termed triguna i.e. consisting of three attributes, Goodness (sattwa), Foulness (rajas) and Darkness (tamas). The designation guna is applied to them as they serve the purpose of others (i.e., the purusas or individual souls of living beings)[2].

The three attributes are the only real material cause of the entire objective universe. In order to

---

1. सत्त्वादीनामतद्धर्मत्वं तद्रूपत्वात् Sāmkhyasūtra 6.39; एते गुणाः प्रधानशब्दवाच्या भवन्ति Yogabhāṣya on Y.S. 2.18; Sāmkhyakārikā 10.

2. गुणाः इति परार्थाः ....Sāmkhyatattvakaumudī on S.Kār. 12.

prove their existence the exponents of Sāmkhyayoga school point out that all the objects of the world are of the nature of love or pleasure (prīti), aversion or pain (aprīti), and stupefication or delusion (viṣāda). These attributes are not subjective or negations of one another and exist as entities in each object independentally whether in a prominent or a subdued state. For example, a single girl-- young, beautiful, gentle and virtuous is a source of pleasure to her husband, that of pain to her co-wives, and that of delusion to another man who is unable to get at her because she has in essence all the three constituent attributes. In this way, the same thorns pinchs ordinary men, delight the camels and also passes the essence of dilfusion for a monk (vītarāgi). Now, these very concrete characterstics of pleasurability, painfulness and dilusion in this manifested(व्यक्त) effects must be presupposed to owe their existence to the same attributes in the unmanifest nature or cause avyakta prakriti or kārma.

Needless to say, the sattwa etc. are technical names, designations of the entities which have been shown in the Sāṅkhyayoga school to respectively possess the above charmcterstics.[1]

To evolve ultimately as pleasure, pain and dilusion for the experience of the living beings

---

1. अत्र च सुखदुःखमोहाः परस्परविरोधिनः स्वस्वानुरूपाणि सुख-दुःखमोहात्मकान्येव निमित्तानि कल्पयन्ति ..... तत्र यत् सुखहेतुः तत्सुखात्मकं सत्त्वम्, यत् दुःखहेतुस्तत् दुःखात्मकं रजः यन्मोहहेतुस्तन्मो-हात्मकं तमः ।। Sāṅkhya tattvakaumudī on S.Kā .13.
Cf. these lines with Bhāmatī on Śāṅkarabhāṣya 2.2.1:
एवं कण्टकाः क्रमेलकस्य सुखं इति मनुष्यादीनामपि प्राणभृतां सुखः स्यात्। न ह्यसौ कश्चित् प्रत्येकं कण्टक इति। तस्मात्सुखादिस्वभावा अपि चन्दनकुङ्कुमादयो जातिकालावस्थाद्यपेक्षया सुखदुःखादिहेतवो, न तु स्वयं सुखादिस्वभावा इति रमणीयम्। However, merit (dharma) and demerit (adharma) impressions of the spirits (puruṣas) are responsible for the predominance of sukha etc. in the particular cases according to this school.

(puruṣas) in the main purpose of these attributes, for which they function as agents /or factors of illumination, activity and restraint.[1] When one attribute is prominent due to some external cause it subdues the other two. For example, goodness attains to its peaceful state only after having subdued foulness (or passion) and darkness. In the same manner the other two attain to their respectively terrible and stupid conditions or status after having subdued the other two. Each attribute is necessarily supported by the other two in its functioning. For example, goodness by itself without the touch of foulness (i.e. activity) would mmmmm remain inert and never be moved to action, and without restraint (a function of the third attribute) would never cease to function even when it is no longer required.[2] The attributes /also

---

1. प्रीत्यप्रीतिविषादात्मकाः प्रकाशप्रवृत्तिनियमार्थाः । अन्योन्याभिभवाश्रयजननमिथुनवृत्तयश्च ॥ S.Kā.12 and Sāṅkhyatattwakaumudī as well as Sāṅkhya-chandrikā on it.
2. Cf. त्रिदण्डविष्टम्भवदमी वेदितव्या इति Matharavritti p.22, and इमे गुणाः परस्पराश्रयाः सर्वकार्यकरणसमर्थाः, यथा त्रिदण्डी परस्पराश्रया कुण्डकादीन् अवष्टभ्नन्ति - 'सुवर्णसप्ततिशास्त्र' (Chinese version, translated into Sanskrit by अय्यास्वामी शास्त्री)p.17 as have been quoted by Dr. A. P. Mishra in his Sāṅkhyatattwakaumudī Prabhā (Satya Prakashan, Allahabad 2nd Ed.1962) (avataraṇikā) p.47.

mutually help each other during the equilibrium state (sāmyāvasthā or pralaya) of the unmanifest or nature even when each is functioning though no diverse creation or evolution takes place.[1] According to concept of परिणाम as discussed earlier nothing that was not can or will be, and hence the functioning or causal operation even in their own pure undisturbed state has to be accepted. Any one or two of these cannot exist without the rest. They are always together and have a joint existence.[2]

---

1. Sāṁkhyatattwakaumudī on the term 'अन्योन्यजनन-वृत्तय : of S.Kā 12; Cf. also ibid on S.kā.10 where सक्रियम् has been explained as parispandavat; Cf. Also विद्वत्तोषिणी on S.Kā.10.

2. अविनाभाववृत्तयः इति यावत् Sāṁkhyatattva on S.Kā.12; Cf.
   अन्योन्यमिथुनाः सर्वे सर्वे सर्वत्रगामिनः ।
   रजसो मिथुनं सत्त्वं सत्त्वस्य मिथुनं रजः ।।
   तमसश्चापि मिथुनं ते सत्त्वरजसी उभे।
   उभयोः सत्त्वरजसोर्मिथुनं तम उच्यते।
   नैषामादिः सम्प्रयोगो वियोगो वोपलभ्यते।। वै० भा० 3/8;

   However, some commentators have combined the epithet वृत्ति independentally with अन्योन्य only and not with each preceeding word आश्रय etc. The import of the S.Kā then will be that each attributes is also capable of performing the function of others i.e. अन्यः अन्यदीयं कार्यं करोति Cf. Māṭharvṛtti, Sanskrit Translation सुवर्णसप्ततिशास्त्र Chinese version quoted on p.100 of सां० त० कौ० प्रभा by Dr.A.P.Mishra.

VI. The Uniform Pattern of Pariṇāma During The Period of Dissolution (Pralaya)

We have noted in the ~~beginning of the~~ previous section that the three attributes are constantly evolutionary in character during a state of equilibrium (sāmyāvasthā) which is not conducing to the diversity of production or creation as found in the universe because the attributes are producing pariṇāma similar to their own nature which remains one and the same. The Rajas attribute in the unmanifest Primordial matter or nature cannot allow the latter to remain idle. Thus, at the time of dissolution the attributes continue to have similar modification (i.e. have uniform nature) and they have no change of form as such. How do the various pariṇāmas or effects like the elements, the intellect etc. take place or begin to evolve during the universal creation ? We have noted above that the attributes also operate by belending which, however, is not possible in the uniform method of operation belonging to them during the dissolution. Hence, the blending and mutual

suppression (aṃgāṃgibhāva) of the attributes, are necessary prerequisites for the process of evolution or creation to start. The diversity of evolution of a substance of uniform nature (or taste) has traditionally been illustrated by the water of the clouds which becomes sweet, bitter, sour etcetera as it comes into contact with the different modifications such as the coconut, wood-apple etcetera. In the latter case the diversity or difference in the modifications of earth are already present before the diversity of evolution takes place but in the former case the relation of subordination or being prominent and subsidiaries respectively cannot be proved to exist prior to the evolutions of the diverse forms of cosmic manifestation.

VII. The Purpose and Progress of Creation According to the School

This relationship of inequality or supression of the attributes among themselves takes place for the benefit (or due to the urgent requirements[1]) of the

1. The attributes work towards a common purpose: प्रदीपवच्चार्थतो वृत्तिः S.Kā. 13; स्वां स्वां प्रतिपद्यन्ते परस्परा- कूतहेतुकां वृत्तिम्। पुरुषार्थ एव हेतुर्न केनचित् कार्यते करणम्। S.Kā.31

spirits or conscious beings (purusas) who are postulated as supervisors or experiencers of the created objects which are inert and possess the characterstics of pleasure, pain and delusion as discussed above. Again all composite (being composed of the attitude) objects, e.g., unmanifest (nature), intellect etc. are meant for another's use like the chair, bed etc.[1] Also the orthodox tradition of scriptures etc. mentions concept of and illustrations during the various ages for the attainments of final beatitude which according to this school consists of the abstraction of the spirit from material existence.[2] The experience of pleasure etc. (bhoga) and ultimate and real separate existence from all forms of matter or the objective realities (i.e. the primordial matter and its manifestations) are the two fold purpose of all creation (srsti) according to the Sāmkhyayoga school.

Yogasūtra 4.14.

1. S.Kā. 17 and Tattwakaumudī on it.
2. तदा द्रष्टुः स्वरूपेऽवस्थानम्   Y.S.1.3.

We have seen that the aim of creation is to serve the two-fold interests of spirits as well as known that the unintelligent prakṛti actively manifests the objects for the same. Hence, all the apparent creation functioning or operation (ārambha) of the Prakṛti involved in the process of the creation of all the products from buddhi downwards to specific elements is practically meant for others. Prakṛti can not practically serve its own sake[1], for, it is not intelligent or conscious (although theoretically it may be said to do so in the act of creation)[2]. One may point out that at least an intelligent supervisor must be accepted to make the activity or functioning of an inert object (like that of a common object of experience say jar, spinning wheel, glass of water etc.) feasible and understandable. To this the Sāmkhyayoga replies that there are instances when insentient or inert (acetana) objects can act for a definite end. It is pointed out, ~~for example,~~

---

1. S. Kā. 58

2. इत्येष प्रकृतिकृतो महदादिविशेषभूतपर्यन्तः ।
   प्रतिपुरुषविमोक्षार्थं स्वार्थं इव परार्थ आरम्भः ।।
   S. Kā. 56.

that the prakrti operates towards the emancipation of the spirit even as the milk flows out for the growth of the calf.[1] After the purpose of purusa, viz., that of distinctive knowledge or self-realisation, has been served prakrti desists from operating with regard to that particular conscious being (i.e. the purusa) even as a dancing girl, having exhibited herself to the spectators of the stage, ceases to dance.[2] The Sāmkhyayoga school postulates the image of a loyal and useful servant who accomplishes much good for his unqualified master through purely unselfish motives, to explain the allegorical generosity of prakrti or its attributes the means of manifold evolutions with respect to the disinterested and 'as-if-ungrateful' purusa.[3]

For the realisation of the above aims the disturbance (ksobha) in the attributes' uniform existence or equilibrium takes place resulting in varied and myriad modifications and evolutions from their unmanifest state. The comparative supression and prominence

---

1. S.Kā 57.
2. S.Kā 59.
3. S.Kā 60.

or inequalities among the attributes (called known as vaiṣamyas) result from this disturbance of harmony (i.e. vimarda or kṣobha)[1]. In this way, the uniform or causal state of the three attributes in the pre-phenomenal or unmanifest stage is able to manifest a vast variety of effects in the process of creation according to the Sāṃkhyayoga theory of creation from the Unmanifest (avyakta); the unmanifest cause changes into the innumerable manifest effects.

But, the realisation of the above purpose (i.e. kṣobha), is made possible through the contact of the subjective spirit (puruṣa) and the objective matter (prakṛti) alone.[2] The two are really different but due to ignorance (avidyā)[3] which is beginningless, the

---

1. S. Kā. 46.
2. पुरुषस्य दर्शनार्थं कैवल्यार्थं तथा प्रधानस्य ।
   पङ्ग्वन्धवदुभयोरपि संयोगस्तत्कृतः सर्गः ॥
   S.Kā. 21; See Y.S. 2.23 together with Bhāṣya for a full discussion of 'saṃyoga.'
3. तस्य हेतुरविद्या Yogasūtra 2.24 and the Bhāṣya on it; यत्तु प्रत्यक्चेतनस्य स्वबुद्धिसंयोगः तस्य हेतुरविद्या । विपर्ययज्ञानवासनेत्यर्थः । विपर्ययज्ञानवासनावासिता च न कार्यनिष्ठां पुरुषख्यातिं बुद्धिः प्राप्नोति साधिकारा पुनरावर्तते । सा तु पुरुषख्यातिपर्यवसानां कार्यनिष्ठां प्राप्नोति । चरिताधिकारा निवृत्तादर्शना बन्धकारणाभावान्न पुनरावर्तते । This vāsanā or natural inclination toward wrong or 'non' knowledge has been defined in Y.S. 2.5. as अनित्याशुचिदुःखानात्मसु नित्यशुचिसुखात्मख्यातिरविद्या ॥

attributes and through them their characterstics of pleasure, pain etc. are apparently identified by the Spirit to be their own.[1] This beginningless chain of apparent identification is technically known as saṁyoga. The knowledge of the difference between Matter and Spirit too is caused by another saṁyoga between them.[2] The ignorance (i.e. mistaken or apparent identification between the essentially opposite realities of Matter (acit) and Spirit (cit)) and knowledge (i.e. that of the difference between them - prakṛti-puruṣa-viveka) are both characterstics of Intellect, the Great Principle, which is the first evolute of the unmanifest, and, hence, both the bhoga and apavarga which ultimately and apparently benefit the puruṣa actually, belong to the Prakṛti itself in the Sāṁkhyayoga school.[3] The puruṣa

---

It is something ante or opposite to knowledge but basically a positive substance. Cf. the concluding portion of the interesting bhāṣya on the above: यथा चागोष्पदं न गोष्पदाभावो न गोष्पदमात्रं किन्तु देश एव ताभ्यामन्यद्वस्त्वन्तरम्। एवमविद्या न प्रमाणं न प्रमाणाभावः। किन्तु विद्याविपरीतं ज्ञानान्तरमविद्येति।।

1. वृत्तिसारूप्यमितरत्र Yogasūtra 1.4. and its Bhāṣya.
2. Cf. T.Kau. S.Kā.21: अनादित्वाच्च संयोगपरम्पराया भुक्त्वा संयुक्तोऽपि पुनः संयुज्यत इत्युक्तम्।।
3. तस्मान्न बध्यतेऽद्धा न मुच्यते नापि संसरति कश्चित्। संसरति बध्यते मुच्यते च नानाश्रया प्रकृतिः।। S.Kā. 62 Cf. also Y.S.4.34; सर्वं प्रत्युपभोगं यस्मात्पुरुषस्य साधयति बुद्धिः। सैव च विशिनष्टि पुनः प्रधानपुरुषान्तरं सूक्ष्मम्।। S.Kā.37; रूपैः सप्तभिरेव तु

The Y.S. 2.25, 26 hold that it is the cessation or absence of contact and not a fresh contact which causes creation (cf. Tatkṛtaḥ sargah in S.Ka.21) and which is itself caused by avidyā - due to the fact of the eighth mode of Prakṛti (Cf. S.Kā.63), viz., that of the differentiating or distinctive knowledge (i.e. tattvajñāna or sattvapuruṣānyatākhyāti), operates or manifests itself. The view of Vācaspati, therefore, does not appear to be in accordance with the basic tenets of the school (cf. Vyāsabhāṣya also on the above mentioned sūtras). Even the Sāṁkhyakarika does not apparently corroborate Vācaspati's view. Although Sāṁkhyakarika 66 admits that saṁyoga does exist even after the fulfilment of the puruṣarthas, yet the absence of viparyaya (i.e. wrong knowledge) which consists of avidyā etcetera (vide S.Kā.47), referred to in the same kārikā clearly implies that even saṁyoga which is caused by avidyā must also cease to exist before the Xxx Kaivalya.

neither experiences nor does anything. His mere proximity[1] to the prakrti is the root of the mistaken identification between himself and the Prakrti,[2] whence He appears as benefitted in the above two ways.[3]

VIII. The Insentient Prakrti as The Creative Factor and Its Relationship with the Purusa

There is an objection, however, to this theory of creation. Consciousness (caitanya) and activity (kriyā) are always found together or co-existent. The one without the other is inconceivable in common

---

बध्नात्यात्मानमात्मना प्रकृतिः । सैव च पुरुषार्थम्प्रति विमोचयत्येकरूपेण।।
S.Kā 63; Also see T.Kau.on Ibid for a lucid exposition of how the Buddhi (the great principle)- the first evolute of the unmanifest - for that matter, serves the ends of the Spirits or the souls.

1. (दर्शितविषयत्वात्)वृत्तिसारूप्यमितरत्र।। ..... व्युत्थाने याश्चित्तवृत्तयस्तदविशिष्टवृत्तिः पुरुषः । तथा च सूत्रम्- 'एकमेव दर्शनं ख्यातिरेव दर्शनम्' इति। चित्तमयस्कान्तमणिकल्पं संनिधिमात्रोपकारि दृश्यत्वेन स्वं भवति पुरुषस्य स्वामिनः (भोगसाधनत्वात्)तस्माच्चित्तवृत्तिबोधे पुरुषस्यानादिः सम्बन्धो हेतुः।

Vy.Bh. on ibid; 'vyutthāna' is technical name for the apparently experiencing or baddha state and 'khyāti' or 'darśana' is the technical name for the state of 'seeing' or realization of distinctness or aloofness.

2. यतश्चैतन्यकर्तृत्वे भिन्नाधिकरणे युक्तितः सिद्धे तस्मात् भ्रान्तिरियमित्यर्थः...
भ्रान्तिबीजं तत्सन्निधानम्। T.Kau.on S.Kā.20.

3. तस्मात्तत्संयोगादचेतनं चेतनावदिव लिंगम्।गुणकर्तृत्वे च तथा कर्तेव भवत्युदासीनः।
S.Kā.20; Cf. ibid 64 and 66; Cf. the beautiful and apt image of such a phenomenon as conveyed in Y.S.1.41, 2.20 and 2.21 as well as S.Kā.59, 61 and 66.

experience. We think rightly, therefore, that only an intelligent being can act and all creation is made possible though action alone. In Sāmkhyayoga theory of creation, however, we find that the intelligent spirit is indifferent as an active agent of creation while the creativ or active principle i.e. the Unmanifest is divoid of intelligence or consciousness. That is why, we see that conscious emotions viz. pleasure, pain etc. are apparently manifested in the unintelligent Prakṛti and that the doership or consciousness (which is necessary for any action, much more so for creation) is the apparent characterstic the Unmanifest in the actual process of creation. In other words, the confusion (bhrānti) regarding the apparent assumption of the alien characterstic of consciousness in the unintelligent Prakṛti, and, that of activity and the characterstics (i.e. experiences, like pleasure etc.) of attributes constituting the Unmanifest in the inactive Puruṣa have to be explained. This is made possible directly through contract (saṃyoga) and indirectly by ignorance or wrong identifica-

tion (avidyā) by way of the special relationship of the helper and the helped[1] that mutually exists between the Prakṛti and the Puruṣa, the, jaḍa and the cetana, the former comparable to a devoted servant and the later to a master. It is, therefore, that the spirit in relation to the (Prakṛti) has been variously described as svāmin and sva,[2] as draṣṭṛ or dṛkśakti and dṛśya[3] or darśanaśakti[4], as puruṣa and sattwa[5], and even as darśaka and nati[6].

Thus, avidyā, saṁyoga and kṣobha are significant stages or postulates for the theory of creation as propounded in the śāṁkhyayoga school.

IX. Vijñānabhikṣu's View Refuted

But, Vijnanabhiksu has a different version about the stages immediately preceding the phenomenon of creation. According to this, after kṣobha there is saṁyoga and then

---

1. S. Ka.20-21 and T.Kau. thereon; Cf. यद्यपि तस्य हेतुरविद्येति योगसूत्रेणानादिविपर्ययज्ञानवासनैव संयोगनिदानमभिहितं तथाप्यवान्तरं संयोगप्रयोजकं परस्परोपकारमाह।
2. स्वस्वामिशक्त्योः स्वरूपोपलब्धिहेतुः संयोगः Y.S.2.23
3. प्रकाशक्रियास्थितिशीलं भूतेन्द्रियात्मकं भोगापवर्गार्थं दृश्यम्। Y.S.2.18; ibid, 2.17; ibid, 4.23.
4. दृग्दर्शनशक्त्योरेकात्मतेवास्मिता Y.S.2.6.
5. Ibid 3.48; ibid,3.54.
6. S.Kā.59.

creation takes place.[1] But this view is clearly untenable and unnatural because saṁyoga being beginningless due to the ~~smx~~ semilar characterstic of avidyā which causes it, cannot and does not require kṣobha as a cause. Kṣobha being required to explain and justify the various dissimilar creations or pariṇāmas during the universal evolution (sṛṣṭi) ~~and therefore,~~ is directly or immediately productive creation proper, there is no need to bring in saṁyoga (at a later stage) which is the common cause of both similar (~~Thecreation~~ during the equilibrium or rest) as well as dissimilar creations as we have discussed above. That the beginningness saṁyoga is a later stage before universal creation as compared to kṣobha is in this way unmaintainable. The view of Vijñānabhikṣu is easily refuted.

X.The Order of Creation

Regarding the order of creation, it is said that from Prakṛti issues Mahat (or Buddhi i.e. intellect), from this Mahat issues Ahaṁkāra (i.e. self-consciousness or egoism)

---

1. ~~S. P. B.,~~ by Vijñānabhikṣu 5.101.

from which proceeds the set of sixteen, from five of these sixteen again proceed the five gross elements.

Mahat is the determining principle (i.e. will) and has eight varient forms viz. Virtue, Wisdom, Dispassion and Power when predominantly affected by the attribute Satwa and the reverse four when equally dominated by the attribute of Tamas.

Ahamkāra is the creative principle or cause of the eleven Indriyas (sense-organs) viz. the intellectual organs - the Eye, the Ear, the Nose, the Tongue and the Skin; those of action - speech, hand, feet, the excretory organs and the organ of generation or reproduction; and, the Manas which is both an intellectual organ as well as that of action - when predominated by the attribute of Sattwa on the one hand, and, of the five Tanmātras[1] (i.e. subtle or primary elements) viz. Sound (shabdā), touch (sparsha), colour (rūpa), taste (rasa) and smell (gandha) when predominated by the attribute of Tamas, on the other. Thus, there is two-fold creation simultaneously out of the Ahankāra.[2]

Thus the creation Indriyas from the sattvika aspect of Ahamkāra, as mentioned above, has got good support from Vachaspati Mishra. According to him, the comparative degree of high, low and lower still capacities illumine (or grasp the objects) or quick and light themselves, belonging respectively to the Manas, the intellectual sense-organs and those of action clearly establish a gradation among the three. Thus, being high, high and small effect of the Sattwa aspect is respectively manifest themselves in these three groups of modified (vaikrta) Ahamkāra.

Regarding the creation or evolution of Indriyas there exists another view point that held by Vijnanabhiksu[1] also. According to this, the mind (manas)

---

1. 'विज्ञानभिक्षु' has also given the following passages from Purana etc. in support of his view in his commentary on Sām. Sūtra. महत्तत्त्वाद्विकुर्वाणान्मनो वैकारिकात्- वैकारिकात्तैजसश्च तामसश्चेत्यहं त्रिधा। भूत॥ वैकारिकाश्च ये देवा अर्थाभिव्यञ्जनं यतः। तैजसानीन्द्रियाण्येव ज्ञानकर्ममयानि च। तामसो भूतसूक्ष्मादिर्यतः खं लिंगमात्मनः॥ सात्त्विको राजसश्चैव तामसश्च त्रिधा महान्। 3/5/30 and 15/34

alone is dominated by Sattwa, while the other ten sense organs cited above evolve out of the predominantly Rajas attribute or aspect of Ahamkāra. That the prakasatva or characteristic of illuminating or making known is not found in the physical world and so even in their primary or elemental state due to the comparative predominance of Tamas (which is āvaraka or covering weighty etc) and also the suppressing of the attribute of Sattwa likewise explains the fact of their having dominant Tamas aspect of modified Ahamkara. Likewise we have been able to explain above the predominance of Sattwa aspect in the case of all the Indriyas according to the view point held by Vachaspati Mishra.

We also know that the attribute Rajas is necessary factor in any modifications to be envolved whether they dominated by Sattwa or Tamas which by themselves are ineffective or inoperative.[2] The Rajas, thus, is not only as much helpful or complementary to the dominating operation or manifestation of the attribute of Sattwa as to that of Tamas, but also a common motioning or motivating factor

---

2 S.Kā.25. and T.Kau. on it.

in the evolutionary or creative operation of all the three attributes taken together. That is why Rajas is rather a common basis in both predomenantly Sāttwic and Tāmasa objects.[1] Īśvarakṛṣṇa, who is equally quoted or accepted as authority by both Vijñānbhikṣu and Vāchaspati Miśra, decidedly and justifiably, therefore, differentiates between the two-fold creation of Ahaṁkār, the one is the group of eleven and the other is the group five primary elements.[2] Hence, by the terms Taijasādubhayam in the very next kārikā He must be expressing the fact of both of these creations being effects of Rajas. Vijñābhikṣu's view that only the last 'sense-organs' are referred to here is clearly misconceived as the division of the sense-organs into these is given after this kārikā and not before.[3]

Next, the basis of holding only two-fold division of Āhaṁkārika creation cannot be maintained according to V's view, for, he implies three-fold division viz. Sāttwika (or vaikārika), Rājasa (or Taijasa) and Tāmasa.[4]

---

1. S.Kā. 25. and T.Kau. on it.
2. S.Kā. 24.
3. See सां० प्रवचनभाष्य 2.18.
4. Ibid.

Even the Sāṁkhyasūtra clearly supports the view of Īśvarakṛṣṇa and Vāchaspati as the standard view-point of the school. The view of Vijñānabhikṣu that 'ekādaśakam' means, 'the eleventh' and not the group of eleven is untenable. The Sūtrakāra has before not only differentiated and separately stated the group of eleven and that of five[1] but has also ~~in the~~ immediately afterwards[2] unmistakably defined the denotation of ekādaśakam as the eleven sense-organs taken together.

There is not sufficient ground therefore, to prove that the sense-organs are not predominantly Rajas as against Sattvika. Hence the view of Vāchaspati appears to be conform to the tone traditions of the Sāṁkhyayoga school.

Each of the Tanmātras manifests one gross physical substance (bhūta).[2] In this way are created or manifested the ether (ākasa) from the sabda (tanmātra), the air (vāyu)

---

1. एकादशपञ्चतन्मात्रं तत्कार्यम् ।। सांख्यसू. 2. 17
2. S. Kā. 57.

from the sparsa (Tanmatra), fire (agni), from the rupatanmātra, water (jala), from the rasatanmātra, and earth (prthvi), from the gandhatanmātra respectively. Without the specific characterstics (avishesh), the gross (vishesh) physical substances (bhūta) which are created by them, the grossness of the bhutas consists in the manifestation of their being characterstic calms or soothing (sānta), turfulent or terrific (ghora) and deleading (mudha) nature.

It is interesting here to note that while the five ultimate (i.e. minutest possible) physical elements bhutas of the NV school consist of the substance and its inherent specific quality,[1] According to this school these bhutas are thr grossest possible products from where they start their enquiry into yet more minute substances which manifest or produces them according to their theory.

Hence, the school does not believe any fresh principle or manifest object (vyakta tattwa) after these mah-bhūtas. Although whole universe consisting of so many

---

1. i.e. पृथ्वी परमाणु = पृथ्वी द्रव्य + गन्ध, आकाश परमाणु = आकाश द्रव्य शब्द and so on and so forth.

phenomenal appearances is moulded out of those gross elements (i.e. the mahābhūtas viz. ākāśa etcetera), yet all such objects, e.g. the jar, the tree etcetera are not at all essentially (tattwataḥ) different from pṛthvī etcetera according to this school because of the fact that both the mahabhutas and their so called products are gross and cognisable by the sense-organs.[1]

This is the order in which the twenty three principles are created or manifested from the unmanifest.

XI. The Divisions of Creation

(A). Pertaining to the intellect

The intellect or principle of thinking (viz. buddhi or

---

1. यद्यपि च पृथिव्यादीनां गोघटवृक्षादयो विकाराः एवं-तक तद्विकारभेदानां पयोबीजादीनां दध्यङ्कुरादयः, तथापि गवादयो बीजादयो वा न पृथिव्यादिभ्यस्त-त्वान्तरम्। तत्त्वान्तरोपादानत्वं च प्रकृतित्वम् इहाभिप्रेतमिति न दोषः। सर्वेषां गोघटादीनां स्थूलता इन्द्रियग्राह्यता च समेति न तत्त्वान्तरत्वम्।

Sāṁkhyatattwakaumudī on S.Kā.3.

pratyaya) which is the first product (vikṛti) in the order of universal creation as referred to in the last section, is that by which one determines or arrives at the definite thoughts.[1] It has eight modes or forms (vṛttis), one of which is (1) avidyā or ajñāna[2] (ignorance) whose role as a necessary factor before the process of creation begins, we have already examined.[3] Another form of pratyaya or buddhi namely (2) jñāna (knowledge) is helpful for, and, therefore, causes the liberation or final emancipation of the spirit.[4] The remaining forms viz., those of (3) adharma (vice or demerit), (4) dharma (virtue or merit), (5) vairāgya (dispassion), (6) rāga (passion), (7) aiśvarya (power or affluence), and (8) anaiśvarya (weakness or inability) are responsible for migration to lower regions (lokas), for migration to higher lokas, for absorption into Prakṛti, for assuming and leaving the gross body (cf. the concept of āvāgamana), for non-obstruction of all desires, and for their frequent obstruction (unfulfilment) respectively.[5]

But, the creation pertaining to the intellect has been

---

1. प्रतीयतेऽनेनेति प्रत्ययो बुद्धिः T.Kau. on S.Kā.46; 'अध्यवसायो बुद्धिः' क्रियाक्रियावतोरभेदविवक्षया S.Kā.23 and T.Kau. on ibid.

2. Cf. Suṣamā p.156, quoted on page 182 of Sā.T.K.Pr.

3. See section VII earlier.

4. ज्ञानेनचापवर्गः S.Kā.44 and Tattvakaumudī on it.

5. Due to the apparent difference of manifestation among them, these types can also be called pariṇāmas (evolutes) of the intellect.

traditionally said to consist of four kinds viz. those of error (viparyaya), disability (aśakti), contentment (tuṣṭi) and perfection (siddhi). These four have as many as five, twenty-eight, nine and eight subdivisions respectively. Thus, in all, fifty forms or evolutes of the intellect may be enumerated as follows.

(1) Viparyaya or ajñāna (error) is of five kinds viz.,[1] ignorance (avidyā); egotism (asmitā), passion (rāga), hatred (dveṣa) and attachment to the body (abhiniveśa) which are respectively called (1) tamas (obscurity), (2) moha (delusion), (3) mahāmoha (extreme delusion), (4) tāmisra (gloom), and (5) andhatāmisra (utter darkness).[2] Again, the first two of these are of eight types each, the third kind is further subdivided into ten and the last two (i.e. (4) and (5)) consist of eighteen subdivisions each. Thus, in all, Viparyaya has as many as sixty-two forms.[3]

(2) Aśakti (disability) has twentyeight subdivisions consisting of the various injuries of the intellect arising out of the paralysis or destruction (vadha) of the

---

1. See Yogasūtra and Bhāṣya 2.3-9. for an elaborate description of viparyaya or ajñāna and its five kinds (which are known as Kleśas as well).

2. See Tattwakaumudī on S.Kā.47; Cf. also Viṣṇupurāṇa 1.5.5. तमोमोहो महामोहो तामिस्रो ह्यन्धसंज्ञितः । अविद्या पंचपर्वैषा प्रादुर्भूता महात्मनः ॥

3. See S.Kā 48 and Tattvakaumudi, as well as extracts from Suṣamā, Vidvattoṣiṇī and Kiraṇāvalī on it (quoted in S.T.Pr. on page 185) for a detailed description.

eleven sense organs viz., blindness (andhatva), deafness (bādhirya), failure of the sensibility of the olfactory nerves (ajighratā), that of the organ of taste, leprosy (kusthitā), dumbness (mūkatā), paralysis of the hands, lameness (paṅgutva), failure of the action of bowels (gudāvarta), impotency (klaivyatva) and idiocy (pramāda), - as well as of those arising out of the absence or lack of the nine kinds of tusti and the eight kinds of siddhi.[1]

(3) Tusti (contentment of the intellect is of nine kinds: viz., the four internal ones relating severally to nature (prakrti), means (upādānas), time (kāla) and luck (prārabdha or bhāgya) as well as the five external ones relating to abstinence from or detachment to the objects of the senses (viz., sound, touch, form or scene, flavour and odour).[2] These nine tustis are also technically known as ambha, salila, ogha, vrsti, pāra, supāra, pārāpāra, anuttamāmbha and uttamāmbha in the Sāṁkhyayoga school.[3]

(4) Siddhi (perfection) of the intellect is of eight kinds viz., reasoning (ūha), oral instruction (śabda),

---

1. S. Kā. 49
2. S. Kā. 50
3. Cf. T. Kau. and Kiranā on Ibid.

(3) study (adhyayana), threefold suppression of pain (duḥkha-vighāta),[1] (7) acquisition of friends (suhṛtprapti) and (8) purity (dāna[2] i.e. attainment of discriminatory knowledge). Nos. (1), (2), (3), (7) and (8) are also called tāratāra, sutāra, tāra, ramyaka and sadāmudita respectively.[3]

The eight modes of intellect described elsewhere[4] are absorbed in this very list. Thus, we can easily include (1) under Viparyaya, (3), (6) and (8) under Aśakti, (4), (5) and (7) under Tuṣṭi and (2) under Siddhi.[5]

(B). Pertaining to the Specific objects.

Out of the three kinds of specific objects we have already dealt with the gross elements.[6] The other two are (1) the subtle or astral bodies (sūkṣmaśarīras or liṅgas), and, (2) the gross bodies →

---

1. Pain or unhappiness is of three sorts according to this school (Cf.S.Kā.1). Liberation from pain is the final aim of the school and hence these three constitute the main divisions of Perfection or power, the rest are only of secondary importance. Cf. T.Kau.on S.Kā.51.
2. " दैप्. शोधने " Siddhāntakaumudī 6.4.68; Cf.Y.S.2.26 alongwith Bhāṣya.
3. See Tattwakaumudī and Kiraṇāvalī on S. Kā.51 for a detailed description.
4. See p. 193.
5. See Tattwakaumudī on S.Kā.46; See last para on page 182 of Sā.Ta.Kau.Prabhā.
6. The worldly objects, e.g., the jar etc. are also included in this category itself. See Section X earlier.

termed sthūlaśarīras) are produced of the parents and are perishable (anitya).[1]

The mergent[2] astral body – formed primordially,[3] unconfined,[4] lasting,[5] composed of the Buddhi and the rest down to the primary elements[6] – migrates,[7] is without enjoyment,[8] and is invested with dispositions (bhāvas)[9]. The Buddhi, Ahaṃkāra etc. always require and, hence, have the support of the other specific objects, viz., the

---

1. S.Kā. 39.
2. कार्यं गमयतीति लिंगम्, हेतुमत्त्वेन व्याप्यलिंगम् । तत्त्वकौमुदी on S.Kā.40; also Cf. चिद्वल्लीकिणी on Ibid; प्रधानकार्यस्य व्याप्तिग्रहात् सर्वस्यापि साक्षात्परम्परया वा प्रधाने लयः तस्य सूक्ष्मशरीरस्यापि लयो महाप्रलये एव ॥
3. प्रधानेनाऽऽदिसर्गे प्रतिपुरुषमेकैकमुत्पादितम् T.K. on S.Kā. 40.
4. आ चाऽऽदिसर्गात् आ च महाप्रलयाद् अवतिष्ठते Ibid.
5. Cf. Ibid. their permanence is thus only relative when compared to Prakṛti or the Puruṣas.
6. The eighteen components of an astral body are Buddhi, Ahaṃkāra, the 11 indriyas and the five primary elements.
7. Cf. जननमरणकरणानां प्रतिनियमात् S.Kā.18 wherein the migration of this body is imposed on the Puruṣa; also cf. S.Kā.40.
8. This is common to all the manifested (vyakta) as well as to the unmanifest, because they are not conscious (cetana) like the spirit (Puruṣa).
9. The creations or forms of the particular Buddhi like dharma, jñāna etc. (Cf. sec. XI (A)).

astral body. They cannot subsist without them[1], even as a painting stands not without a ground, and as the shadow cannot subsist without a stake.[2]

The astral body, by means of its compulsory association with the intellectual products or dispositions including virtue and vice etcetera, & determines and ensures due experience (bhoga) of the puruṣas – consequent upon their past deeds, by assuming different gross bodies (in each individual case of God, man, demon etcetera according to the concept of through migration. This dramatic sequence and role of the astral body may be compared to that of an actor of the stage. It can assume any gross body according to requirement in any time or place due to its union with the predominant (i.e. multifarious) power of prakṛti.[3]

---

1. This rule does not apply to Buddhi etcetera during the period before the creation of the तन्मात्रs without which there cannot be an astral body. Cf. बुद्ध्यादिलिङ्गमात्रस्य इत्यत्र सर्गक्रमे पंचतन्मात्रोत्पत्तेः पूर्वं बुद्ध्यादिषु बुद्ध्यादित्वस्य हेतोः सत्त्वात् च उक्तसाध्यस्याभावात् व्यभिचारः स्यात्। अतो हेतौ प्रत्युत्पन्नपञ्चतन्मात्रत्वे सति इति विशेषणम्। तथा च तदानीं पञ्चतन्मात्रोत्पत्त्यभावेन उक्तहेतुत्वाभावान्न व्यभिचार इति भावः। Suṣamā on Sa.Kā.41. (quoted on p. 175 of Sā. T. Prabhā).
2. S.Kā.41; this very migrating astral body is commonly referred to as अंगुष्ठमात्रं पुरुषं (Cf. [illegible] 296) which lies in the gross bodies. Before assuming a fresh gross body in the place of an old one, the buddhi etcetera (which are nonspecific) must be accepted in the astral body (Cf. the concept of [illegible]).

3. S.Kā.42.

The dispositions of the astral bodies are of two kinds. The first one consists of the innate (sāṃsiddhika) imparted to them at the beginning of creation.[1] For example, Kapila, etc. were born with innate dispositions of dharma, jñāna vairāgya and aiśvarya. The other kind is the incidental (vaikṛtika) dharma adharma etc. which are brought about by personal effort like the worship of God etc. as was the case with Ṛṣi Vālmīki, for example.

The gross physical body is time and again being created or manifested different stages, e.g. that of the aggregate formed of the uterine germ, flesh, blood etc.[2] inside the womb, and those of childhood, youth etc. after emerging out of it.

Thus, in a nutshell, we have dealt with the division of the [illegible] threefold creations of the specific objects. We are now in a position to appreciate the fact that without intellectual dispositions or modes (viz. dharma etc.[3])

---

1. S.Kā. 43; and T.Kaum, विद्वत्तो. on [illegible].
2. 'Kalala', budbuda, māṃsapiṇḍa, erinze etc. are the stages of the creation or manifestation inside the comb of the gross body.
3. See XI (A).

C. Both the above divisions of creation are necessary and complementary

We are now in a position to appreciate the fact that without intellectual dispositions or modes (viz. dharma etc.[1]) there would be no creations of the specific objects (viz. that of the astral and gross bodies) because the former motivate and determine the details of the latter in the case of each puruṣa and similarly without the latter creations[2] there would be no development (i.e. additions, alterations etcetera) due to the incidental dispositions as referred to above. Both the divisions are necessary and complementary. Hence, both the divisions of creations are justified on the ground of serving the spirits' interests.[3]

D. Pertaining to the physical substances or gross elements (bhautikasarga)

The whole[4] of the gross physical universe has been divided into three groups viz. (1) the divine beings i.e. the

---

1. See. XI (A) earlier
2. Sec. XI (B).
3. S. Kā. 52 and T.K. on ibid.
4. Cf. ब्रह्मादिस्तम्बपर्यन्तः S. Kā. 54.

the Brahmās, the Prajāpatis, the Indras, the Pitṛs, the Gandharvas, the Yakṣas, the Rākṣasas, and the Paiśācas; (2) the five kinds of lower animals i.e. the quadrupeds having hoofs, those hoofless and having varying numbers of legs like the mice and the ants etcetera, creeping things like the snakes etc., and the immoveable ones like the tree etcetera; and (3) the single type of human beings.[1]

All these fourteen types of beings enumerated above reside in three sorts[2] of elemental creations. ~~There is~~ Sattwa, Rajas and Tamas respectively predominate in those who live on (1) the higher, (2) the middle and (3) the lower planes. The highest plane contains the following regions: Bhuvaḥ, svaḥ, mahaḥ, janaḥ, tapaḥ and satyam. The earth having seven continents and oceans - is the middle region where the beings abound in pain and are given to actions righteous or otherwise.

Thus, we see that the divisions of creation on the gross physical level is largly in accordance with the

1. S.Kā.53 and T.K. as well as Suṣamā on ~~ibid~~ ibid.
2. S.Kā.54.

age old beliefs and traditions of the common men. The division of creation pertaining to the specific objects, except where the tanmātras are said to be the cause of the mahābhūtas, too, conforms to the traditions of the purāṇas and Kāvya literature. Even the intellectual creations have not much to contribute to the already affluent stock of mythologies and theories set up in our law-books and purāṇas. But the acute analytical insight, minute observation and a systematic process of the evolution implied in the treatment of ignorance, knowledge, contentment and disability et cetera amount to an all-time great contribution to world philosophical literature.

XII. Conclusion

We have so far been critically evaluating the theory of creation in the Sāmkhyayoga School in its various aspects and details. Some characterstically novel or interesting features may be noted by way of conclusion:

(a) The purpose of creation is to facilitate (i) the

experiences (bhoga) in accordance with the innate as well as incidental dispositions of the intellect, and final emergence as his own real self. The former aim is similar to those of the orthodox schools like the NV, PM, etc., while the latter brings it nearer to Vedānta in some respect where, however, the soul attains liberation or his real status of identity jīva and Brahma rather than a discriminating knowledge bet. Puruṣa and the Prakṛti.

(b) The intellect or the great Principle is the first in order of manifestation or creation from the ultimate unmanifest Prakṛti. The SK theory of creation deals more with psychological and abstruse existences than any other orthodox school of Indian Philosophy. It is predominantly intellectual compared to the materialistic approach of the NV and the idealistic view point of Vedānta.

(c) The Prakṛti is the state of equilibrium of the three attributes which operate mutually and variously to manifest the twenty three principles (tattwas) at the beginning of creation after their harmonious process of

of evolution (pariṇāma) during the period of dissolution gets disturbed due to its contact between the conscious being (Puruṣa) concerned, the latter (i.e., contact) being caused by beginningless ajñāna. The creations or manifestations case to operate the moment jñāna, another mode of Buddhi, makes the individual Puruṣa see the functions and manifestations of the Prakṛti as really different from it. The intellect and the rest dissolve in the reverse order of their earlier manifestation into the ultimate unmanifest cause (the Prakṛti).

(d) The creation on manifestation of the principles is individualistic. The same creation agency viz., the Prakṛti which causes experience of pain etc. also liberates the Puruṣa so that, thenceforth, the intellect etc. do not exist as manifest objects with regard to such beings.

(e) The school postulates an indiscrimanating non-sentinel agent as active energy for creation, while the conscious being is entirely aloof, yet, contributing through the impact (bimba) of its conscious-

ness (caitanya) on the former, to the eventual evolution (pariṇāma) of the manifest objects as well as to achieving his illusory or even unreal ends of (1) experiencing the sensations of pleasure and pain and (2) emancipation or identity with his real self so distinct and aloof from the Prakṛti and its pariṇāmas.

The mutual, and apparent, rather than real assumption of the other's characterstics between the Puruṣa and Prakṛti has been explained by the image. The assumption of the reddishness of the japākusuma by the pure white sphaṭikamaṇi due to the proximity of the former to the latter. This confusion (bhrānti) due to ignorance (avidyā) has a most vital role to justify the utility of the creative activity of the insentient unmanifest. Herein we find evidence of the great imagination genius that the Sāṁkhyayoga school employs to postulate an extremely delicate and mainly intellectual theory of creation.

(f) The concepts of the migrating astral bodies, perishable gross bodies, the law of karman and the different kinds divine, human and lower beings, the

different regions (lokas) as are familiar to every orthodox school of India Philosophy have been ably and eminently fitted into the overall theory of creation according to the Sāmkhyayoga school.

(g) The theory of the cause and its effect being essentially non-different and the production or creation of the so-called effects being just manifestations or evolutions of the cause is a distinctive feature of the theory of creation in the S.Y. school and even helps in establishing a single, common and ultimate cause for all the effects or creations of the universe.

It vehemently contradicts the theory of causation (ārambha) as propounded in N.V. ~~and the Purvamimamsa~~ and appears rather similiar to the approach of the Advaita Vedānta in this respect, as all objective existence is traceable to one ultimate source; but then, the concepts of the realisation of all the forms or manifestations of the primeval matter as well as the separate identity of the souls are ~~not~~ opposed to the latter school, ~~and~~ similar to the other orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy.

(h) At best God is only a specially qualified Purusa useful in our spiritual advancement or tattwa jñāna and no importance to Him is attached in the theory of creation. He is therefore often not even mentioned in standard texts of the school, except in Yoga at the prākrti or practical level (vyavahāra-bhūmi) and the popular Indian literature like that of the purusas and the Mahābhārata etc. are more concerned with religion and devotion than with mere knowledge[1] at the theoretical level (siddhāntabhūmi).

---

1. क्लेशकर्मविपाकाशयैरपरामृष्टः पुरुषविशेष ईश्वरः
Y.S.I.24.

CHAPTER ~~4~~ VI

The Pūrvamīmāmsā

I. General Background

According to the Pūrvamīmāmsā school of Indian Philosophy the Vedas are accepted as the only infallible source of the knowledge of dharma which consists in what has been enjoined in them as conducive to the welfare of man.[1] The ordinary means of cognition - perception, inference and the rest cannot be of much use independently.[2] The emphasis by this school on the active aspect of duty or religion of man highlights the requirements of the Pūrva (i.e. preliminary) stage before the uttara (i.e. final) stage of the realization of ultimate knowledge (jñāna).[3] It is, therefore, quite natural that the whole of the first chapter adhyaya of the Mīmāmsāsūtra is devoted to the question as to what portions of Veda directly lay down the acts to be done and those

1. Mīmāmsāsūtra 2.
2. Ibid 4; Tantravārttika (Benares Sanskrit Series edition), p.50.
3. Pūrvamīmāmsā in its sources, p. 7. (B.H.U., 1964)

forbidden. The remaining eleven adhyayas set forth the methods of the right interpretation of the text.

It is clear from what has been said above that, although, the Vedic texts, whose interpretation forms the main topic for consideration of the school, do contain several theories of creation, the Pūrva-mīmāṁsā concerns itself purposively with the active (or karma) aspects of dharma[1] consisting of sacrifical rites[2] rather than knowledge of any metaphysical theories including those of creation.

It is due to its non-metaphysical approach that Dr. Jha rightly observes: "Mīmāṁsā proper has never

---

1. 'It will be seen that for Jaimini - in fact for all Indian Philosophers,- the connotation of the term 'Dharma' is very much wider than that of 'Religion'; it stands for the whole duty of Man, the performance of which is conducive to his welfare - here, in this world during present life ,as also elsewhere, after death'. Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources, by Dr. G.N. Jha (B.HU, 1964) p.8.

2. Ibid p.8; Ibid p. 316.

claimed to be a 'Darśana', a system of Philosophy. In fact, so far as the Sūtra is concerned it does not take into cognisance of any philosophical topic except that of Pramāṇas, Perception and the rest. The commentators have introduced such topics as the 'soul' and the Apūrva', but only as corollary to its main theme of 'dharma', Duty of Man; if there is no Soul and no Apurva, there can be no point in performing Dharma, one's Duty; hence these have been set forth by the later exponents; the soul has been specially emphasized; but regarding any detailed investigation and consideration of this Soul, the older writers have deliberately referred the enquirer to the 'Vedānta'. Says Kumārila at the end of his Ātmavāda, in the Ślokavārttika – इत्याह नास्तिक्यनिराकरिष्णुरात्मास्तितां प्रति भाष्यकृदत्र युक्त्या। दृढत्वमेतद्विषयः प्रबोधः प्रयाति वेदान्तनिषेवणेन॥

The two systems of Pūrvamīmāṁsā and Vedānta are complementary to each other or rather represent the two aspects of one and the same goal.[1] This contention is supported by the significant terms pūrvamīmāṁsā (preliminary discourse) and uttaramīmāṁsā (final

---

1. Ibid. pp.5 to 7.
2. Ibid. p.4.

discourse) traditionally applied to them. Thus the teacher of the uttara school may equally pass for that of the purva as well.[1] In fact the study of the uttara school necessitates that of the purva[2] and Badarayana too does not explicitly deny the authenticity of the Purvamimamsa theories.[3]

II. No Universal Creation And Dissolution

There is no basis for the assumption that there is a creation and evolution of the world, consisting in the birth and destruction ~~f~~ of all things.[4] In fact the

---

1. In support of purely Mimāmsā topics Jaimini quotes Bādarāyaṇa, the author of Uttaramīmāmsā, with great reverance and is in agreement with his views. Cf. Mīmāmsāsūtra 1.1 .5;5.2.19;6.1.8; 10.8.44; and 11.1.64.

2. Śāmkarabhāṣya on Vedāntasūtra 4.1.8. Hence the Vedāntins oft-quoted statement व्यवहारे तु भाट्टनयः. see for examples of मीमांसान्याय adopted by the Vedāntins Chapter 33 of Purvamīmāmsā in its sources.

3. Both Jaimini (Cf. Sūtra 1.1.5) and Bādarāyaṇa (Sūtra 3.2.40) refer to each other. It is interesting to note that the latter does not question the views of the Pūrvamīmāmsā while refuting the various theories of creation opposed to it, and that the Jaiminisūtra, too, does not ctiticize any of the views of the Vedānta.

4. Ślokavārttika(सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार)113. But, we find that

very concept of causality involving the separate identity or distinctive nature of cause and effect is implied to be only based on worldly usage or common reasoning[1]. This shows that they believe in satkāryavāda[2].

The mīmāṁsaka is a staunch opponent of any theory of dissolution without which the traditional theory of creation having a beginning as well as an end at certain points of time is rendered ludicrious or even

---

Kumārila accepts both creation and dissolution of the universe and this contradicts himself.
मन्त्रार्थवादेतिहासप्रामाण्यात्सृष्टिप्रलयावपिष्येते तत्र सृष्टिकाले प्रजापतिर्योगी तस्मिन्काले पुण्यकर्मोद्भवाभ्युपगमेन पशूनामभावात्स्वमाहात्म्येनात्मन एवयशुस्म्भीनिर्माय यथोत्पन्नानाविकृतवांस्ततो समाप्त एव कर्माणि त्वपरः पशुभिर्यतः इतिदृशमिदं कर्म प्रत्यक्षफलम्। एवं च महता यत्नेन प्रजापतेश्चरितमिति सर्वं सत्यमेव। प्रतिसृष्टि चतुर्लिंगन्यायेन तुल्यनामप्रवाहव्यापारवस्तुरूपत्वेनानित्यताप्रसंग इति। p. 28 (तन्त्रवार्तिक Pub. by Messers Braj B. Das & Co. Benares Sanskrit Series. No. 5, 1882) p.28. Thus, we may conclude that they often deny the beginning or dissolution of the universe due to an apparent lack of interest in it only. That world of things really was and shall be as it is, their chief purpose in such sweeping remarks against established orthodox views on creation. In other words, they are too concerned with the present duties of man and the practical role of wordly things their in to imagine a pre-phenomenal stage of reality.

1. Bṛhatī (and Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā on it) p. 83, (Madras University Edition), p. 33.
2. Critical Bibliography (मीमांसाकुसुमाञ्जलि) p. 29, by Dr. U. Mishra (Published by B.H.U.) p. 29.

impossible. Thus, it is maintained that the entire world of composite things down to the dvyaṇuka according to the atomic process, cannot become dissolved simultaneously as such a fact is beyond our common experience according to which we find that while one thing is coming into existence another is disappearing.[1] This constant creation and dissolution of the things the world makes the mimāṃsaka's oft-quoted saying 'na kadācidanidṛśamjagat' intelligible to us and signifies the complete unlikelyhood of the universe as a whole ever being created or dissolved according to the Pūrvamīmāṃsā school.

We know that the earliest literature of Pūrvamīmāṃsa viz., that of the mimāṃsāsūtra does not at all talk about creation. But, the commentators like Prabhākaramiśra and Kumārilabhaṭṭa have dealt with the problem of creation as we have noted above. The later mimāṃsists or neomimāṃsists have expressed their willingness to

---

1. कथमेकदैव सर्वेऽवयविनो विलीयन्त इति समभिगमनीयम्। अधुनैव किमिति कस्यचिदुदयः कस्यचिद्विलय इति नाभ्युपेयते दृष्टानुगमादिति मन्यामहे। Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā p.191 (Bṛhatī, University of Madras Edition).

accept. God as the creator of the universe as well as the existence of creation and dissolution of the universe.[1]

III. The Process of Creation of the Non-eternal Realities and The Role of Unseen Force therein

However, individual composite wholes or aggregates of the four substances[2] viz., earth, water, fire and air like the jar, cloth etc. have admittedly always continued to be created and dissolved according to the atomic process[3] and are perceptible due to their large dimension made possible by not-less-than-three

---

1. Mimāṃsābhyudaya (Kumbakonam,1925) by D.T. Tātācāryaśiromaṇi, pp.115-122; सर्वसिद्धान्तसंग्रह 8.40-41; A Commentary on षड्दर्शन समुच्चय attributes to Jaimini the doctrine of maya. ~~(see p.76 of~~ The Karma Mimamsa by A.B. Keith (Heritage of India Series) Calcutta,1921, p.16

2. Prakaraṇapañcikā (B.H.U.Darśana Series Edition, 1961) pp.83-84.

constituent particles or parts.[1]

The Pūrvamīmāṁsā does not object and, therefore, implyingly approves of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika theory of creation so far as the role of adṛṣṭa (or apūrva) and the atoms[2] is concerned. Thus, it is said that all worldly things including the bodies and the various regions (lokas) etc. are composite in their nature and come into existence through the conjunction (saṁyoga) of their constituent parts right from the coming together of the two atoms which is brought about by their vibration or motion due to the conjunctions of the souls influenced by the Unseen Force (adṛṣṭa or destiny) consisting of merit and demerit (dharma and adharma).[3] The action of the destiny is no other than its coming into existence and this is brought about or produced by such acts as sacrificing and the like.[4]

The Pūrvamīmāṁsā deals predominently with the subject of karma or acts of the souls which result in merit and demerit.[5] The production or creation or even

---

1. See the Prābhākara view set forth in Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources, pp. 56-57.
2. Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources, p. 68 (Lines 20-36)
3. Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā pp. 190-191.
4. [illegible] Ibid., p. 191; Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources, p. 316.
5. Prakaraṇapañcikā (p. 156) (referred to in Pūrva. p. 31).

non-production during the liberated state, of the bodies is dependent on the individual soul's merit and demerit.[1] It is only for the experiencing of the reaction of the past karma (i.e. adṛṣṭa or apūrva both due to dharma and adharma) that the soul is born in or burdened with the physical body.[2]

Body (i.e. the bhogāyatana) is created or made up of earth only. It is only of three kinds - (1) womb-born (jarāyuja), e.g. the human beings and the animals; (2) Egg-born (aṇḍaja), e.g. the birds, the snakes etc; and (3) sweat-born (svedaja), e.g. the louses, the bugs etc. The traditional fourth type of vegetable (vanaspati or udbhij) body is not admitted, as we have no proof for the existence of the sense-organs in this case. The mind and the tactile organ[3] are present in all these bodies.

Particular cognitions (jñānas) which are always

---

1. Ślokavārttika(सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार)108-110; Cf. Nyāyaratnākara and Kāśika on Ibid(आत्मवाद)106.
2. Ślokavārttika, Ibid, 108-110
3. Elsewhere we find the details of all the five sense-organs viz., the olfactory, the gustatory, the visual, the tactile and the auditory. Cf. Ślokavārttika(प्रत्यक्ष)51 and Nyāyaratnākara on it. ibid.

found to be transitory[1], are possible because of the contact of the two substances viz. the mind and the soul, resulting from merit and demerit attaching to the soul. These contacts are produced or created by a certain action of the mind, again, caused by either the efforts of the embodied soul, or by the unseen forces[2] which are the effects of previous mind-soul contacts; and so the infinte cycle goes on.[3] However, in addition to the mind-soul contact, the particular action of the concerned sense-organs e.g. the visual etc. is also necessary[4] for the production of cognition; otherwise, a blind man might also be reasonably capable of perceiving colour, which is not a fact. In other words, sense-organs are the instruments of cognition while the mind-soul contact is the common[5] cause of the production (or creation) of all cognitions or experiences including those of the inner objects i.e., pleasure, pain etc. as well as those pertaining to the outer objects, e.g. the jar, the tree etc.[6] These experiences (i.e. bhogas)

---

1. Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā p.191
2. i.e. due to the endless series of merit and demerit, - the accumulated effects of past acts of the individual concerned. Cf. Prābhākara School of Pūrvamīmāṁsā (1911) by Dr. G.N. Jha, pp.77-78.
3. Prakaraṇapañcikā pp.150-51
4. Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources p.83.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid. p.232 (referred to on p.36 of Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its sources.)

take place or are produced only in the physical body (i.e. the bhogāyatana) which acts as their common abode or receptacle,[1] whose production we have already discussed in the preceding para.

In this theory of creation, motion or action (karman) is the passing of a thing through certain conjunctions and disjunctions with points in space (i.e. dik). It comes into existence and is dissolved as is perceived[2] by us in common experience.[3]

The objects of the world (padārthas) have not been systematically mentioned in the well-known treatise of the Pūrvamīmāṃsā.[4] A short account of the non-eternal objects as is available with us, however, may not be found out of place in our general understanding of the theory of creation according to this school. Four categories of such things have been accepted, viz. those of substance (dravya), quality (guṇa), action (karman) and constituent part[5] (avayava). Inherence[6] (samavāya)

---

1. See ft.n.6 on p.217 earlier.
2. According to some it is inferred Cf. Pūrvamīmāṃsā in its sources pp.78-79.
3. Śāstradīpikā p.50 (referred to in Ibid p.58).
4. See Pūrvamīmāṃsā in its sources Ch.VII (introductory lines).
5. Śābarabhāṣya on Mīmāṃsāsūtra 10.3.44.
6. Ślokavārttika on 1.1.4(प्रत्य)146-150.

is actually found to be ephemeral. For instance, the inherence between the community (jāti) and the individual (vyakti) comes into existence when the vyakti is produced and it perishes as soon as that individual perishes.[1] Similarity (sādṛśya) is accepted as a category of reality as it enters into our consciousness exactly in the same manner as any other category.[2] Particularity (viśeṣa) is, in fact, only the quality of separateness (pṛthaktva) which differentiates the ultimate substances in the shape of atoms.[3] Darkness (tamas) is not a distinct substance.[4]

IV. The Uncreated Eternal Realities

The uncreated eternal realities are of two kinds viz., the ubiquitous ones consisting of the souls, time space and word or sound, as well as the atomic ones consisting of the atoms of earth, water, fire and air and also the minds. That the atoms and the mind have movement at different points of time and space and contribute to

---

1 Prakaraṇapañcikā pp.90-93.

2. Ibid, pp. 268-69.

3. Ibid, p.268

4. Prakaraṇapañcikā pp.322-323; Rāmānujācāryatantrarahasya pp.17-18 (referred to on p.245 of Bhāratīya Darśana by Umeśmiśra)

creation on the physical and psychic planes respectively, and that the individual souls are both the experiencer and the main beneficiary of creation as well as the actor or doer of acts which result in the all-important and binding production or operation (consisting of its coming into existence in all cases) of the unseen force or destiny - is evident from what we have already said above. We do not require to go into other aspects or details of these realities, in our present context.

V. Śakti As Causal Energy

According to this school every thing in this world, whether eternal or non-eternal, possesses a potency, power or capacity (śakti) which can be inferred from the fact of its (i.e. the things) bringing about or producing a certain effect. For example, the visible form of fire remains unchanged while it burns; this leads us to the conclusion that there is something in fire by virtue of which it can burn and in the absence of which it could not burn.[1] This factor enabling a thing to produce its effects is imperceptible and known as Śakti. It is eternal in eternal things, and

1. Prakaraṇapañcikā pp.218-219.

subsists transitorily in transitory or non-eternal things together with which it is created and dissolved.

In this way, although the mimāmsakas do not accept the theory of causation (ārambha) they account for the phenomenon of production or creation in each case by postulating a potency or causal energy, so to say, native to all things in the universe. Thus, it may be asserted that the unseen force, the atoms, the souls and minds etc. are able to participate in the process of creation due to an innate śakti in them.

VI. Non-being And Creation

Non-apprehension or non-cognition is the sixth means of cognition through which the non-being or non existence (abhāva) of things becomes cognised or known.[1]

This non-being which is a real entity[2] (vastu) is of four kinds: (1) previous non-being, (2) non-being by destruction, (3) mutual non-bring, and (4) absolute non-

---

1. Ślokavārttika (abhāva) 1-2.
2. Ibid, 2-9.

being-as found, for example, in that of curd in the milk, that of milk in curd, that of cloth in the jar, and that of horns in the ass respectively.

The nos. (1) and (2) are relevant to the theory of creation in the Pūrvamīmāṃsā as the transitory things constantly come into existence and cease to exist or get destructed. The role of non-being here is similar to that of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika theory of creation.*

VII. God And Creation

Orthodox Indians in general and Nyāyavaiśeṣika in particular, for example, believe that the unseen force is non-intelligent or unconscious by its very nature, and that, as a matter of fact, no unintelligent entity is found to act except under the guidance of an intelligent operator. The souls cannot cognise or know the unseen force which consists of their own merit and demerit and under whose influence they constantly remain, and, as such they are unfit to supervise, operate or guide it. Hence, a giant controller or superviser of super-intelligence, viz. (God) should be

---

The Pūrvamīmāṁsā strongly attacks the above view and contends that no such supervisor or God is required to operate in the process of creation[1] and, that the above concept of God is too flimsy to receive serious consideration.[2]

The following grounds have been adduced by the various exponents of this school for rejecting the postulation of God as creator:

(a) The Pūrvamīmāṁsā believes in the eternality of word (or sound), its meaning and the relationship between these two, hence, the postulation of God as setting up the entire verbal convention or process is rejected outright.[3] The doctrine of the self-sufficiency of the Veda presupposes its being independent of all personal (or creative) agency.[4]

(b) Dharma and adharma (e.g. those of the men and the animals) belong to the bodies of the individual souls, and, hence, the ultra-mundane God, however intelligent cannot have their knowledge in the absence of which no

---

1. If the conscious souls are unable to control their destiny by reason of their being non-cognisant of it how can an entirely different intelligent being (i.e. the Super-Soul or God) be its controller ? Cf. Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā pp. 190-191; Also some things, e.g. the bodies of men and animals, are brought into existence by the operation of their parents and not by any external supervising agency. Cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā p. 306 et seq.
2. Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā, pp. 190-191.
3. Ślokavārttika (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार) 41 et. seq; Mīmāṁsāsūtra, 1.1.5; Bṛhatī, p. 174 et. Seq. Prakaraṇapañcikā p. 230 et. seq.
4. Prakaraṇapañcikā, p. 301, et. seq. Śābara Bhāṣya on Mīmāṁsā Sūtra 1.1.27. et seq.

effective control of them is possible.[1]

(c) The supervision exercised by God cannot be of the nature of contact with Him because dharma and adharma are qualities and contact (samyoga) is possible between or among substances alone. Nor can the supervision be of the nature of inherence because they already inhere in the other souls cannot inhere in God also. There is no other type of relationship that could be said to exist between God and destiny.[2]

(d) Supervision is performed through contact of the ordinary agents (e.g. the carpenter etc.) with the tools and instruments as well as with the materials (the wooden pieces in the above case) on which the man works. But, the instruments of creation viz. dharma and adharma likewise cannot have contact with any operation of things, as they are qualities.[3]

(e) Soul (or an intelligent being like man for that matter) is in fact found capable of supervision over

---

1. Prakarana Pancika, p.306 et.seq.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.

that body alone which he ensouls due to his dharma-adharma, but the atoms cannot be said to be such a body of God and hence he cannot supervise the operations or action of the atoms.[1]

(f) God must make an effort like the soul in his supervisory role of the body, to move the atoms even if they are taken as constituting his body for the sake of argument. Then, the atoms being eternal the creative process or activity would also be similar. Hence, no dissolution or period without creation is possible and also God would be ineffective in controlling it.[2]

(g) The analogy of the creation of the jar by the potter, extended further, would require God also to be a corporeal being. But we know that no corporeal being can excercise any effective control over such subtle things as atoms, dharma and adharma which have definite roles to play in the creation of body itself.[3]

---

1. Prakarana Pancika, p.306 et.seq.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.

(h) Then God Himself as a corporeal being would have to be supposed as the creation of another supervisor or creator and so on and on ad infinitum.[1]

(i) The action bringing about the creation of the universe cannot be held to be in the atoms operating under the will of God. The mere wish of a conscious being is never known to move or cause action in inert things in our common experience.[2]

(j) The knowledge of pre-phenomenal or pre-creation stage or that pertaining to the period of dissolution - as to the form in which the creator existed, or the conditions in which the things of the world remained then, is not possible to be determined, as none of us, in the present times, have witnessed the beginning of creation.[3]

(k) It is a matter of common experience that desire arises only in embodied or corporeal intelligent beings, but at the beginning of creation earth etc. would not be there to make up the body of God in whom the desire to create (sisṛkṣā) is said to arise.[4]

---

1. Ibid.
2. Ślokavārttika (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार), 82.
3. Ibid, p.41 et.seq.
4. Ibid. 47.

(l) At the beginning of creation there must have been no material to work upon and implements to work with, as are known to us be common experience.[1]

(m) The all-powerful God must have a purpose for his activity of creation and this cannot be compa-rison because then the world would be made entirely happy which is not the case, pain and suffering a bound in the world.[2]

(n) No sane person undertakes activity without a purpose and God could not be an intelligent person if he is held to create without any self interest or motive.[3]

(o) He cannot be said to create out of adesire for sport (tita) because he is aptakama or at least would be too much busy in carrying out all the operations necessary to create and carry on the world to be happy over it and regard it as a sport.[4]

(p) The mere assertion by the Creator Himself about His desire to multiply as found in the Upanisadic

---

1. Ibid. 50,51.
2. Ibid. 52.
3. Ibid. 55.
4. Ibid. 56.

texts is not enough to bring conviction to us worldly people.[1]

(q) If the world's creation were a process dependant on the whim of the creator there would be no reasonable basis for the popular doctrine of Karma or destiny(based on fair-play) which, itself, if believed to function, could very well be regarded responsible as bringing about the things of the world. Karma of living beings is a responsible factor or agency (if such a one must needs be postulated) for creation.[2]

(r) If the bodies of men etc. are held to have been created by God merely because they are bodies, the same would apply to God also and his body would require another creator. On the other hand, He cannot be without a body on the analogy of the potter creating the jar and also due to the common experience that only corporeal beings are able to make effort without which no activity is possible.[3]

(s) God cannot also be the Vedāntic Supreme-self

---

1. Ibid. 60
2. Ibid. 73-75.
3. Ibid. 77-79

existing alone before the beginning of creation who by his own wish evolves out of Himself the earth, water and other things, because the all-pure supreme self cannot evolve out of Himself things opposite in nature[1] (i.e. impure). The experiences of the impurities like pain and suffering cannot proceed from illusion which can niether be justified to inhere the supreme self nor be due to some other cause, in which case the theory of one cause becomes abandoned.[2]

A prominent sub-school of Purvamimamsa (viz. that of Kumarila) has been felt to believe in the existence of one eternal Super-soul (paramātman) identical beings (jivātmans).[3] This is the teaching of the Vedānta also and the Slokavārttika ends its treaties on soul with the declaration that the sound knowledge of soul (ātman) is to be obtained from the Vedānta.[4] It appears

---

1. Purvamimamsa believes in Satkāryavāda. See critical bibliography (मीमांसानुक्रमणी) by Umesh Misra, p.2
2. Slokavarttika (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार) 82-86; For the refutation of Samkhya Theory of Creation, according to the viewpoint of this School, see Ibid.87-101.
3. Sarvasiddhāntasaṁgraha by Saṁkarācārya (Ch.VIII on भट्टाचार्य) Verses 10, 36 and 38. (Madras, 1909, edited by Raṅgācārya).
4. इत्याह नास्तिक्यनिराकरिष्णुरात्मास्तितां भाष्यकृदत्र युक्त्या दृढत्वमेतद्विषयश्च बोधः प्रयाति वेदान्तनिषेवणेन ॥
   Slokavarttika (आत्मवाद) 148.

that Kumārila was a believer in parmātman in its impersonal aspect, though was opposed to the idea of a Personal World-Creator (as seen above). However, we may by this confusion in the words of the great modern mimamsakar Dr. Gangānātha Jhā, that "if he had really believed in the Super-soul, it seems impossible that he should not have asserted that belief and should have left it to be inferred from his reference to the Vedanta, which, too, does not necessarily[1] indicate his belief in the Super-soul."[2]

We may, therefore, conclude that the school, not only does not believe in God but, is strongly opposed

---

1. Even Prabhākar, however, is not against the existence of God.
'एवं चानुमानिकत्वमेव ईश्वरस्य नित्यत्व निराकृतं नेश्वरोऽपि निराकृतः। अत एव न प्रभाकरगुरुभिः ईश्वरनिरासः कृतः। तत्समर्थनं च वेदान्तमीमांसायां क्रियते इत्यभिप्रेतम्। अत एवाहुः आत्मवादान्ते 'इति युक्तिकषायमेव एतत् कथनीयं, न कर्मसंगिनाम्' इति सर्वमुपपन्नम्। प्रभाकर विजय पृ0 76-83'
Mimāmsākoşah Ed. by Kevalānanda Saraswati (प्राज्ञ पाठशाला मण्डल ग्रन्थमाला, 1953, Satara) Vol. II p.1080

to the possibility of His being the Giant Superintendent of the process of creation.

VIII. Conclusion

We may, now, briefly point out some of the most distinguishing characteratics of the theory of creation according to the Purvamimamsa school:-

(a) The Supervision of the work of creation being impossible, it has to be regarded as a never-ending process of the things coming into existence (or being created) and passing out of it or being destroyed, under the influence of the dharma-adharma (i.e. the unseen force or destiny) of the souls ensouling these things; and, there is no reason for the assumption of an Ultra-Cosmic 'God-creator'.[1]

(b) The universe is made up of constituent parts which, individually have their beginnings one after the others and they also cease to exist one after the other. In fact, this view supported by our actual

---

1. Prakaran Panchika, pp.306 et seq.

every day experience.

(c) The mimāmsaka lay's stress upon the reality of the external world, because if cognition had no real basis or reality in the external universe itself, all that has been declared in the Veda with regard to the worldly and supernatural results following from actions would be rendered meaningless or without purpose to the common man.[1]

(d) The world of actions and their fruits is too much with the Pūrvamīmāmsā to allow it to analyze the realities of the world minutely and formulate an independent or viable theory of creation in comparision with those of the other orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. In fact, its theory of creation is a roughly modified version of that of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika to suit its own requirements.

(e) Paramount faith in the infallibility, supremacy and self-sufficiency of the Veda indirectly

---

1. Slokavārttika (निरालम्बनवाद), 3-15.

and the acts enjoined by it directly, greatly would the non-theistic as well as realistic nature of its theory of creation.

CHAPTER - VII

The Vedānta

I. Introduction

The Vedānta bases all its theories on the evidence of the Upaniṣadic statements[1] (representing the śrutiprasthāna) and, as such, also the Brahmasūtra of Bādarāyaṇa (representing the nyāyaprasthāna) as well as the Bhagavadgītā (representing the smṛtiprasthāna) have been the constant source of interest and hence even difference of interpretation, to several orthodox Indian Philosophers.[2] The Vedānta (especially that of Śaṁkara) has a very large literature and has been the most widely studied and professedly[3] followed school of orthodox Indian philosophy even in the modern times. We

---

1. वेदान्तो नामोपनिषत्प्रमाणं तदुपकारीणि शारीरकसूत्रादीनि Vedāntasāra; वेदान्तवाक्यकुसुमग्रथनार्थत्वात्सूत्राणाम्। वेदान्तवाक्यानि [illegible] सूत्रैः विचार्यन्ते। Brahmasūtraśāṁkarabhāṣya 1.1.2.

2. The following commentaries are well-known: (1) Śāṁkarabhāṣya (788-820); (2) Bhāskarabhāṣya (9th Cen.A.D.); (3) Rāmānujabhāṣya (12th Cen.A.D.); (4) Nimbārkabhāṣya (13th Cen.A.D.); (5) Mādhvabhāṣya (13th Cen.A.D.); (6) Vallabhabhāṣya (1479-1544 A.D.); (7) Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya (13th Cen.A.D.); (8) Śrīkarabhāṣya (14th Cen.A.D.); (9) Vijñānabhikṣubhāṣya (16th Cen.A.D.); (10) Baladevabhāṣya (18th Cen.A.D.); and (11) Śaktibhāṣya (20th Cen.A.D.)

3. Cf. the saying अन्ते वेदान्तिनः सर्वे।

propose, however, to deal with the salient features of the theory of creation as followed by its following six eminent exponents (ācāryas) only for the sake of convenience.

II. The Śaṁkara[1] School.

Unqualified reality alone is the origin of creation

According to Śaṁkara, the beginningless indefinable and undifferentiated principle called avidyā, which is at the root of all creation (prapañca) is dependent on the one attributeless unconditioned ultimate reality (Brahman).[2] The avidyā in the prephenomenal or pre-creation stage subsists as energy or potency (śakti) of Brahman and is known as unmanifest power (avyakta māyā)

---

1. Liberal help has been taken from the material information contained in the research paper 'शांकरवेदान्त में जगत्प्रपञ्च का मूल कारण' Univ. of Allahabad Studies, Vol.3 (N.S.), No.1, 1971, by Dr. Suresh Chandra Srivastava.

2. सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेक मेवाद्वितीयम् Chāndogyopaniṣad 6.2.1.; एकमेवाद्वितीयं Chān.6.2.1; अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपम् Kaṭha 3.15; निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तम् Śvetā.6.19;

as the created universe of names and forms has not come into existence.[1] Due to this very śakti the Brahman having eternally pure existence[2] is also called sarvaśaktimān,[3] parameśvara[4] and māyin.[5] These apparent[6] denotations or descriptions, however,

---

1. अविद्यात्मिका हि बीजशक्तिरव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासुषुप्तिः Śāṅkarabhāṣya 1.4.3; सतां विद्यमानानां स्वेन अविद्याकृतनामरूपमायास्वरूपेण सर्वभावानां विश्वतैजसप्राज्ञभेदानामुत्पत्तिः Māṇḍūkya-bhāṣya 1.6.

2. अस्ति तावद्ब्रह्म नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावं सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्तिसमन्वितं ब्रह्मशब्दस्य व्युत्पाद्यमानस्य नित्यशुद्धत्वादयोऽर्थाः प्रतीयन्ते बृहतेर्धातोरर्थानुगमात् Śāṅkarabhā. 1.1.1.

3. परिपूर्णशक्तिकं तु ब्रह्म। Śāṅkarabhā. 2.1.24; सर्वशक्तियुक्ता च परा देवतेत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम् Ibid, 2.1.30; प्रतिषिद्धसर्वविशेषस्य ब्रह्मणः सर्वशक्तियोगः सम्भवति Ibid, 2.1.31;

4. आत्मैव परमेश्वरः प्रतिपत्तव्यः। Śāṅkarabh. 4.1.3; निरवयवस्य च व्योमवत् सर्वगतस्य अमूर्तस्य आत्मनः केनचित् संयोगानुपपत्तेः सिद्धं क्षेत्रज्ञस्य नित्यमेवेश्वरत्वम् Gītābhāṣya 13.2; परमेश्वरस्य सिद्धं निर्विशेषत्वमेकत्वं च Ibid, 13.27; स्वयम्भूतमपि परमेश्वरं नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावं सर्वभूतात्मानं निर्गुणं संसारदोषबीजप्रदाहकारणं मां नाभिजानाति Ibid. 7.13; तद्विपरीतमपहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणकं पारमेश्वरं स्वरूपम् विद्यया प्रतिपद्यते सर्पादिविलयनेनेव रज्ज्वादीन् Śāṅkarabhā. 1.3.19; प्रतिषिध्यत एव तु परमार्थतः सर्वज्ञात् परमेश्वरादन्यो द्रष्टा श्रोता वा नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा श्रोता इत्यादिना Ibid 3.1.17.

5. प्रकृतिं तु मायां विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्। Śvetāśvataropaniṣad 4.10.

6. वाचोऽभिधानानि द्रव्यादिसविकल्पवस्तुविषयाणि वस्तुसामान्यान्निर्विकल्पे अद्वयेऽपि ब्रह्मणि प्रयोक्तृभिः प्रकाशनाय प्रयुज्यमानान्यप्राप्यैव नि[illegible] स्वसामर्थ्याद्धीयन्ते Taitt. Bh. 2.4; also Kenopaniṣad 1.4.

do not contradict or modify the attributelessness of Brahman (i.e. the unqualified or pure reality).[1]

This unqualified parabrahman is also the material cause of the universe in as much as nothing else as absolute or true reality in his opinion.[2] Śaṁkara interprets the different passages of the Upaniṣads in order to illustrate his contention that Parabrahman is the sole reality or material (upādāna) of the universe.[3] The same Brahman is also the efficient cause of all creation.[4] The assignment of desiring to become many and procreate to ultimate reality proves that Parabrahman alone is the efficient cause as the willing intelligent agent and the material cause as the one

1. अनिरुक्ते निलयने(Taitti.Up.2.7.1.) इति चावाच्यत्वं नीलोत्पलवद्-वाच्यार्थत्वं च ब्रह्मणः Taittirīyabhāṣya 2.1.
2. प्रकृतिश्चोपादानकारणं च ब्रह्माभ्युपगन्तव्यम् Śaṁkarbha.1.4.23।
3. एवं यथासम्भवं प्रतिवेदान्तं प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तौ प्रकृतित्वसाधनौ प्रत्येतव्यौ Ibid 1.4.23।
4. तस्मादधिष्ठात्रन्तराभावादात्मनः कर्तृत्वमुपादानान्तराभावाच्च प्रकृतित्वम् Ibid.1.4.23।

getting transformed into several entities in the process of creation.[1] The Upaniṣads expressly state that all the elements are created from and also dissolve into the one and the same principle. That from which some other thing springs, and into which it returns, is the material cause of that other thing is a well known fact, e.g. the earth is clay is the material cause of rice, barley etc.[2] Thus, the Brahman is spoken of as acting on itself as the material[3] and is exalted as the maker, the Lord, the person who has the source in Brahman[4], and that which the wise regard as the origin of all beings.[5] That (tyat) pure existence (i.e. Brahman) as well as this (sat) appearance as many

---

1. Ibid.1.4.24;

2. Ibid.1.4.25; Cf. सर्वाणिह वा इमानि भूतानि आकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्ते आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्ति Chā.1.9.1.
3. Taitt.2.7.

4. यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं, कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम्। Muṇḍakopaniṣad 3.1.3;
5. Ibid. 1.1.6;

found in the universe, or, in other words, as the undifferentiated or unmanifest as well as the differentiated or manifest.[1]

All states or conditions of creation or appearance originate from the attributeless Brahman alone and the final cause can be neither māyā nor the qualified Brahman[2] or soul.[3] This is the fundamental concept of

---

1. Taitti.2.6;

2. According to the Vivaraṇa school the pure consciousness, i.e., the ultimate reality is both the material and the efficient cause of creation only in its qualified state, i.e., with māyā as the limitating factor. Cf. जगदुपादानमायाश्रयतया ब्रह्म कारणम् Pañcapādikāvivaraṇa p. 652; रज्ज्वाः संयुक्तसूत्रद्वयवत् माया-विशिष्टं ब्रह्म कारणम् Ibid.; उपक्रमादिभिर्लिङ्गैस्तात्पर्यस्य विचारणात्। असंगं ब्रह्म मायावी सृजत्येष महेश्वरः ।। Pañcadaśī 6.195; मायाधीनचिदाभासः श्रुतो मायी महेश्वरः। अन्तर्यामी च सर्वज्ञो जगद्योनिः स एव हि।। Ibid.6.157.

3. According to the theory of dṛṣṭisṛṣṭivāda, as propounded by Prakāśānanda, the soul is the main cause of the unreal appearance of the manifold universe because the avidyā or māyā, the material cause of creation, belongs to it. Cf. आत्मन्येव जगत्सर्वं दृष्टिमात्रमतत्सुखम्। उद्भूय स्थितिमासाद्य विनश्यति मुहुर्मुहुः ।। Vedāntasiddhāntamuktāvalī 22; स्वकीयस्वाविद्यया जीवभावमापन्नस्यैव ब्रह्मणः प्रपञ्चकल्पकत्वादीश्वरोऽपि सह सर्वज्ञत्वादिधर्मैः स्वप्नोपलब्धदेवतावज्जीवकल्पित इत्याहुः। Siddhāntaleśasaṅgraha p.105; मायैवोपादानं, ब्रह्म तदाधारभूततया। गौण्योपादानमिति प्राहुर्मुक्तावलीकाराः ।। Siddhāntakalpavallī 37.

Vedānta according to this school.[1] The ultimate reality alone[2] is the cause of the Universe expressed in the scripture and arguments in conformity with it.[3] That omniscient[4] omnipotent cause from which proceed the origin and the subsistence[5] and dissolution of this world - which sṛṣṭi is differentiated by names and forms,

---

1. तस्मात्सर्वज्ञं ब्रह्म जगतः कारणं नाचेतनं प्रधानमन्यद्वेति सिद्धम् Śaṁkarabhā.1.1.11.
2. सर्वविकल्पास्पदत्वं न परस्मादात्मनोऽन्यत्रोपपद्यते। Śaṁkarabhā.1.1.16, परस्माद्धि ब्रह्मणो भूतानामुत्पत्तिरिति वेदान्तेषु मर्यादा। Ibid 1.1.22; परमेश्वरस्य सर्वजगतः कर्ता सर्ववेदान्तेष्ववधारितः। Ibid.1.4.16; कार्यमाकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चं जगत्कारणं परं ब्रह्म। Ibid.2.1.14; सन्मात्रमेकमेवाद्वितीयं परमार्थसत्यं तदस्य जगतो मूलम् Chāndogyabhā.6.8.7; सर्ववेदान्तेषु सृष्टिस्थितिसंहारकारणत्वेन ब्रह्मणः प्रसिद्धत्वात् Śaṁkarabhā.1.2.9; सर्वे एतस्मादात्मनो व्युच्चरन्ति इति सोपाधिकानामात्मनामन्यतो व्युच्चरणमामनन्तः परमात्मानमेव कारणत्वेनामनन्ति। Ibid.1.4.18; सर्वस्य हि विकारजातस्य आनन्दमयस्य कारणत्वेन व्यपदिश्यते। Ibid.1.1.20 परस्मादेव ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायते इति वेदान्तमर्यादा। Ibid.1.4.18; अक्षरात्परतः परः इत्यत्रापि न प्रकृताद्भूतयोनेरक्षरात्परः कश्चिदभिधीयते। Ibid 1.2.21;
3. अत आगमवशेनागमानुसारितर्कवशेन च चेतनं ब्रह्म जगतः कारणं प्रकृतिश्चेति स्थितम् Ibid.2.1.11.;
4. सर्वं च तद् ज्ञश्चेति सर्वज्ञम् Māṇḍūkyakārikābhāṣya 3.36; सर्वज्ञं च तेनानवच्छिन्नदेशकालत्वात्, कालाकाशादिकारणत्वाच्च, निरतिशयसूक्ष्मत्वाच्च न तस्यान्यदविज्ञेयं सूक्ष्मं व्यवहितं विप्रकृष्टं भूतं भवद्भविष्यद्वास्ति तस्मात्सर्वज्ञं तद्ब्रह्मेति Taittiryopaniṣadbhāṣya 2.1; उपाधिपरिच्छिन्नज्ञानस्य सर्वज्ञत्वाद्यसम्भवः Śaṁkarabhā.1.3.4;
5. Cf. the six stages or phases of existence enumerated by Yāska: षड् जायते - अस्ति - वर्धते - विपरिणमते - अपक्षीयते - नश्यति Nirukta 1.1.1.

contains many agents and enjoyers,[1] and is the abode of the deeds and their results particular in places and times, and the nature of whose arrangement cannot even be considered by the mind – is Brahman.[2]

However, the apparent act of creation or manifold appearance of the universe does not pertain to the immutable, attributeless, pure reality which is its origin, because the characterstics of cause may qualify the effect but not vice versa.[3] For example, the creation or appearance of snake which originates in the rope, its cause (or source of its real existence) cannot be

---

1. Śaṁkarabhā.1.1.2.
2. अस्य जगतो नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य अनेककर्तृभोक्तृसंयुक्तस्य प्रतिनियतदेशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाश्रयस्य मनसा अपि अचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य जन्मस्थितिभङ्गं यतः सर्वज्ञात्सर्वशक्तेः कारणाद् भवति तद्ब्रह्म इति। Ibid 1.1.2.
3. अनन्यत्वेऽपि कार्यकारणयोः कार्यस्य कारणात्मत्वं न तु कारणस्य कार्यात्मत्वम् 'आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः' इति वक्ष्यामः। Ibid 2.1.9.

said to constitute a characterstic or the nature of the rope which remains unchanged or undifferentiated.[1]

The Concept of Causation

Before analyzing the concept of causation with reference to the theory of creation as propounded by the Śaṁkara school, we may conveniently point out the three levels or aspects of existence based on experience, as have been suggested by Śaṁkarācārya. Parabrahman is the only essentially true metaphysical reality because its existence is never limited in respect of time (i.e. present, past and future). The second level of existence, which is totally unreal even from the point of view of worldly appearance, can be illustrated by the knowledge of snake (due to delussion or mistake), which is proved incorrect, in a matter of moments, when we clearly come to realise that it was a rope. This false momentary appearance is called

---

1. अविशेषेण त्रिष्वपि कालेषु कार्यस्य कारणानन्यत्वं श्रूयते। तत्र यः परिहारः कार्यस्य तद्धर्मैरविद्याध्यारोपितत्वान्न तैः कारणं संसृज्यत इति' ' ' 'एवं परमात्मापि संसारमायया न संस्पृश्यत इति Ibid 2.1.9।.

prātibhāsiki sattā. The third level or phase of existence, we experience in the matter-of-fact world on which we are based our day-to-day dealings.

The creation of this practically true state of existence of the things of the world like the jiva etc. can be explained or reasonably demonstrated in this very vyāvahāriki sattā. On the highest plane, therefore, there is no diversity (dvaita) and hence no creation is possible. The second level of existence is clearly (i.e. quite convincingly) unreal as shown above. The third state of existence is only practically (vyavahārataḥ) real but not absolutely or essentially (tattvataḥ) so from the view point of the transcendental or absolutely monistic (advaita) aspect of reality[1] (pāramārthiki sattā[2])

---

1. अपि च नेयं पारमार्थिकी दृष्टिसृष्टिः येनापूर्येत प्रयोजनम्। न हि स्वप्नगन्धा-लातचक्रमायागन्धर्वनगरादिविभ्रमा समुद्दिष्टप्रयोजना भवन्ति। Bhāmati 2.1.3

2. Thus, regarding the practical or created reality of soul (jiva) etc. it is said: अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितकार्यकरणोपाधिनिमित्तोऽयं शारीरान्तर्यामिणोर्भेदव्यपदेशो न पारमार्थिकः। एको हि प्रत्यगात्मा भवति न द्वौ प्रत्यगात्मानौ सम्भवतः एकस्यैव तु भेदव्यवहार उपाधिकृतः, यथा घटाकाशो महाकाश इति। ततश्च ज्ञातृज्ञेयादिभेदश्रुतयः प्रत्यक्षादीनि च प्रमाणानि संसारानुभवो विधिप्रति-षेधशास्त्रं चेति सर्वमेतदुपपद्यते। तथा च श्रुतिः - 'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति

The concept of causation implies, therefore, according to Śaṁkaravedānta, that the effect is non-existent (asat) having only an illusory appearance and the cause alone exists being absolute existence (paramārthasat). It can then aptly be described as satkāraṇavāda, because the substrate of all the illusory effects is absolutely real and may also be taken as a type of satkāryavāda (i.e. the belief in the existence of effect even prior to manifestation) from which it greatly departs in view of the strictly idealistic non-dual reality it preaches.

Theory of creation, then, is also unreal from the view point of true existence. The apparent or undeniably practical existence of the created universe is caused by ignorance (avidyā).[1]

-तन्के तदितर इतरं पश्यति' इत्यविद्याविषयं व्यवहारं दर्शयति। 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्' इति विद्याविषये सर्वं व्यवहारं वारयति। Ibid 1.2.20;
यस्मिन्सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवाभूद्विजानतः। तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः।। Īśāvāsyopaniṣad 7. हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्यापिहितं मुखम्। तत्त्वं पूषन्नपावृणु सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये।। Ibid.15; सत्यस्य सत्यम् Bṛhadā. Up. 2.1.20.

1. Ibid.

Thus, the created universe is not a real product or effect (vikāra) but an unreal or illusory appearance (vivarta).[1] It is in this context that the oft-quoted statement of an advaitavedāntin, 'brahma satyaṁ jaganmithyā'[2] can be properly understood. In other words, according to Saṁkarācārya, there is in reality (i.e. the ideal or absolute aspect of existence) nothing else than the one uncreated or unborn principle (viz. ātman or Brahman) and the creation (viz. prapañca) of practical realities is only an experience or phenomenon due to avidyā.[3] It is declared, therefore, that the passages setting forth the creation (sṛṣṭi) and so on subserve the purpose of teaching Brahman (i.e. the Absolute Reality) one, although these may be conflicting with regard to the order of the things created

---

1. सतत्त्वतोऽन्यथा प्रथा विवर्त इत्युदाहृतः । अतत्त्वतोऽन्यथा प्रथा विकार इत्युदीरितः ॥ Vedāntasāra by Sadānanda (apavādavarṇana)
2. Cf. वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् । Cha. 6. 1. 4; इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा Bṛha. Up. 2. 4. 6.
3. विज्ञानात्मपरमात्मनोरविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपरचितदेहाद्युपाधिनिमित्तो भेदो न पारमार्थिक इत्येषोऽर्थः सर्ववेदान्तवादिभिरभ्युपगन्तव्यः Śāṁkarabhā. 1. 4. 22; ब्रह्मावगतिर्हि पुरुषार्थः निःशेषसंसारबीजाविद्याद्यनर्थनिबर्हणात् Ibid 1. 1. 1. सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् Cha. 6. 2. 1; एको वशी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा एकं रूपं बहुधा यः करोति Kaṭho. 2. 5. 12; नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन Bṛhadā. 4. 4. 19.

such as ether and as on, they do not conflict with regard to the creator on account of its being represented as unformly described in them.

The appearance of manifold objects which are unreal as mentioned above, is superimposed on the uniform existence. The former are known as non-self or non-reality (anātman or avastu) and the latter as the self of the nature of pure existence, consciousness and bliss (ātman or brahman). This beginningless phenomenon of superimposition (technically denoted by the term adhyāsa [1]) is caused by wrong knowledge (avidyā) whose removal is the chief aim of the advaitavedā-

---

1. तमेतं लक्षणमध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते।
Śāṁkarabhā. 1. 1. 1.; एवमयं सर्वकल्पनात्मनि द्वैतस्याकल्पितत्वात्। कथम्? सुख्यहं दुःखी मूढो जातो मृतो जीर्णो देहवान् पश्यामि व्यक्तो-व्यक्तः कर्ता फली संयुक्तो वियुक्तः क्षीणो वृद्धो अहं त इत्येवमादयः सर्वे आत्मन्यध्यारोप्यन्ते। आत्मैतेष्वनुगतः सर्वत्राव्यभिचारात्। यथा सर्पधारादिभेदेषु रज्जुः। Māṇḍūkyakārikābhāṣya 2.32; ... एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः। अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते। यथा चायमर्थः सर्वेषां वेदान्तानां तथा वयमस्यां शारीरकमीमांसायां प्रदर्शयिष्यामः। See Adhyāsabhāṣya at the beginning of Śāṁkarabhā.

nta.[1] The characterestics of createdness and manifoldness etc., as evident in non-reality, are entirely opposed to reality to which they were erroneously attributed. The practical state of existence or illusion appears as real only as long as the knowledge (vidyā[2]) of the truth or absolute reality has not disproved or ended it. In this way, we find that the avidyā plays a most vital role in the theory of creation according to the Śaṁkaravedānta.

Illusion or wrong knowledge, however, does not take place in void / i.e., it always has some basic[3] reality which lies temporarily and practically concealed during its operation. For example, the practical reality (vyāvahārika sattā) of the pearl-oyster lies concealed to the viewer as long as the superimposition of the unreal silver due to wrong knowledge is not destroyed by subsequent knowledge of its reality (tattvajñāna). In the case of the illusion or false appearance of the practical diversity of

---

1. Ibid.

2. अविद्यायाश्च विद्याविरोधित्वान्निवृत्तिः । ' ' ' विद्यायां हि सत्यां उदिते सवितरि शार्वरमिव तमः प्रणाशमुपैत्यविद्या । Gītābhāṣya 2.69; सकृत्प्रवृत्तैव ह्यात्मप्रतिपत्तिरविद्यां निवर्तयति / Śāṁkarabhā. 4. 1.

3. ते च प्राणादिभावा अध्यवसायेनैव सतात्मना विकल्पिताः न हि निरास्पदा काचित् कल्पनोपपद्यते । Māṇḍūkyabhā. 2.33.

existence (prapanca) or creation (srsti) the essential unity of reality lies concealed.[1]

Thus, the concept and role of avidyā in creation as revealed in the Sāmkaravedānta clearly demonstrates the erroneousness, illusoriness and unreality of the phenomenon of creation. Also it is evident from the above that avidyā as manifested in these illusions is not the cause but only a via media for the causality of Brahman in the process of creation.[2] Further, all the distinction or differentiation as cause and effect or the productive and the produced among the various things and experiences of the universe are only imposed and imaginary.[3]

The Process of Creation and Dissolution

We have already seen, how the illusory appearance of the universe, its existence from the practical worldly

---

1. ऐकात्म्याप्रतिपत्तिर्या स्वात्मानुभवसंश्रया। साविद्या संसृतेर्बीजं तन्नाशो मुक्ति-रात्मनः। Naiskarmyasiddhi 1.7.
2. एवं परमात्मनः तमः प्रतिबिम्बकं जगत्कर्तृत्वं व्रजतीत्येके नैतदयुक्तम्। परम चैतन्यमेवात्मतयावबोध्यते। आवरणद्वारा तत्पर्यायविषयीभूतशुद्धात्मनि विवेकात्तेषामेवं भ्रमो जायते। Samksepasariraka 1.333. संक्षेपशारीरककृतस्तु ब्रह्मैवोपादानं कूटस्थस्य स्वतः कारणत्वानुपपत्तेर्माया द्वारकारणमकारणमपि कार्यमनुगच्छति मृद इव तद्गतस्वभावत्वादेरपि घटे अनुगमदर्शनादित्याहुः। Siddhāntaleśasamgraha by Appayya Dikṣita (Ed. Ms. Gangādhara Sāstri Mānavalli), p. 13, E.J. Lazarus & Co.
3. एवमाकाशस्थानीयात्परमात्मनः पृथिव्यादिभूतसंघाता आध्यात्मिकाश्च कार्यकरण-लक्षणा रज्जुसर्पवद्विकल्पिता जायन्ते। Māndu. Bhā. 3.3.

aspect, and the disappearance of that false superimposition, are really meant by universe being created, being existent and getting dissolved.

Now the order in which the things of the world are created has been described by Śaṃkarācārya in the following manner.[1]

The attributeless Brahman in its supremely pure form begins to appear as conditioned or qualified by the attribute or of limitation of māyā no sooner than the unmanifest (avyakta) māyā inclines towards manifestation. This is the prājña state from the individualistic aspect of Brahman which in its total aspect is called the Inner Controller, the Lord (antaryāmi īśvara). In view of the totality of the above conditioning factor this itself is the Blissful Reality (Ānandamaya Brahman). The limitation of Brahman at this stage is called 'the causal conditioning' (kāraṇopādhi).

After this, the Brahman, when qualified by more manifest

---

1. Aitareyopaniṣadbhāṣya 3.1.3.

names and forms of māyā in totality, is called the Golden Embryo (Hiraṇyagarbha). Brahman, in this second stage when qualifed by the minute conditioning (sukṣmopādhi) in its individual aspect, is called Taijasa.*

After this comes the third stage of the gross conditioning (sthūlopādhi) in its total aspect when the embodied Brahman is known as All beings (vaiśvānara)

---

1. पञ्चीकृतपञ्चमहाभूतानि तत्कार्यं सर्वं विराडित्युच्यते। एतत्स्थूल-
शरीरमात्मनः। इन्द्रियैरर्थोपलब्धिर्जागरितम्। तदुभयाभिमान्यात्मा विश्वः
एतत्त्रयमकारः॥ अपञ्चीकृतपञ्चमहाभूतानि पञ्चतन्मात्राणि, तत्कार्यं च
पञ्चप्राणाः दशेन्द्रियाणि मनोबुद्धिश्चेति सप्तदशकं लिङ्गं भौतिकं हिरण्यगर्भ
इत्युच्यते। एतत्सूक्ष्मशरीरमात्मनः। करणेषूपसंहृतेषु जागरितसंस्कारजः
प्रत्ययः सविषयः स्वप्न इत्युच्यते। तदुभयाभिमान्यात्मा तैजसः। एतत्त्रयमुका
रः॥ शरीरद्वयकारणमात्माज्ञानं साभासमव्याकृतमित्युच्यते। एतत्कारण-
शरीरमात्मनः। तच्च न सत् नासत्। नापि सदसत्। न भिन्नम् नाभि-
न्नम् नापि भिन्नाभिन्नं कुतश्चित्। न निरवयवम् न सावयवम् नोभयम्।
किं तु केवलं ब्रह्मैकत्वज्ञानापनोद्यम्। सर्वप्रकारज्ञानोपसंहारे बुद्धेः
कारणात्मनावस्थानं सुषुप्तिः। तदुभयाभिमान्यात्मा प्राज्ञः।
एतत्त्रयं मकारः॥ Pañcīkaraṇam.

or even as the Ruler of all the created-beings (prajāpati). Brahman at this stage of gross conditioning in its individual aspect is called the viśva.[1]

The differentiation of or manifold manifestation as names and forms, of the avyaktamāyā in the material creation, also, in order of the ether (ākāśa) etcetera[1] is in the same three stages of kāraṇa, sūkṣma and sthūla.[2] In the last stage, the creation or production of gross elements viz., the ākāśa etcetera is by way of the process of quintuplication (pañcīkaraṇa) of the formerly minute elements.[3]

The Prajāpati under the limitations of the gross forms (i.e. in both the conscious and the material fields) alone is liable to be created, to subsist and to be dissolved in the forms of various living beings and inert objects

2. See ft. note 1 on p. 250 for reference here

3. पन्चानां भूतानामेकैकं द्विधा विभज्य स्वार्धं विहायार्धभागं चतुर्धा विभज्येतरेषु योजिते पन्चीकरणं ... प्रपन्च्यते। Pañcīkaraṇam by Śaṁkarācārya (The works of Sri Śaṁkarāchārya Sri Vani Vilas Edn. p. 189-190)
Cf. Also द्विधा विधाय चैकैकं चतुर्धा प्रथमं पुनः। स्वस्वेतरद्वितीयांशैर्योजनात्पन्च पन्च ते। Pañcadaśī 1.27.

1. Cf. तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः सम्भूतः आकाशाद्वायुः वायोरग्निः अग्नेरापः अद्भ्यो पृथिवी Taitti. Up. 2.1.

3. ~~Foot note no.1 of Page 250.~~
4. F.N.1 above.

See ft. note on p. 250.

right from the Brahmā to the tuft of grass (at the lowest level).

Each of the above stages (avasthās) of the Brahman is described as the effect of its previous stage, even as the earthen lump and the jar are known as cause and effect respectively in the process of creation. This latter designation of being cause and effect, however, as already mentioned elsewhere is related to the practical world (vyavahārajagat).

The omniscient Lord of all (i.e. Brahman with the attribute or condition of His power or māyā) is the cause of the creation of this universe in the same way as clay is the material cause of the jars and gold of the golden ornaments; by His rulership He is the cause of the subsistence of this universe once created, just as magician is the cause of the subsistence of the magical illusion; and lastly He is the cause of this created world being finally resolved or dissolved into Himself just as the four classes of being viz., the womb-born (jarāyuja) etc. are absorbed into the earth (pṛthivī).[1]

---

1. सर्वज्ञः सर्वेश्वरो जगत उत्पत्तिकारणं मृत्सुवर्णादय घटरुचकादीनाम्।

1. Cf. इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयते Ṛgveda 6.47.18, देवात्मशक्तिं स्वगुणैर्निगूढाम् Śvetāśvatara 1.3.

The theory of creation according to the Sāṃkaravedānta also envisages periodicity of the process of creation and dissolution (viz. kalpas) like those in several other orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. Also, the order of creation is exactly the same in each creation and that of dissolution in the reverse order is also similar. The phenomenal world is the same in all kalpas or cycles of existence (i.e. creation and dissolution regularly succeeding each other after equal duration). The gods like the Hiraṇyagarbha etc. manifest themselves in each new creation and continue their previous forms of existence therein. The common beings bear the same names and forms as in the preceding creation, and owing to this similarity of names and forms, the admitted periodical renovations of the universe in the form of general annihilations and general creations are expressly mentioned by the śruti as well as the smṛti according to the Sāṃkara

---

उत्पन्नस्य जगतो नियन्तृत्वेन स्थितिकारणं, मायावीव मायायाः। प्रसारितस्य च जगतः पुनः स्वात्मन्येवोपसंहारकारणम्, अवनिरिव चतुर्विधभूतग्रामस्य। स एव च सर्वेषां न आत्मेत्येतद्वेदान्तवाक्य-समन्वयप्रतिपादनेन प्रतिपादितम्। Sāṃkarabhā.2.1.1.

school.[1]

The Purpose of Creation

The theory of creation, as we have so far evaluated above, refers to the apparent world only which is characterised by name and form, the figments of wrong knowledge or nescience. It, moreover, aims at intimating that Brahman is the immutable (akṣara[2]) self (i.e. basic reality) of everything.[3]

Again, Brahmans creative activity (if we must use the term) is due to mere spot (līlā) such as we find in ordinary life. This assertion is in reply to the common reasoning that not even a senseless person acts without any purpose. The activity proceeding from

---

1. Śāmkarabhā. 1.3.30; सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत्। दिवं च पृथिवीं चान्तरिक्षमथो स्वः॥ Rgveda 10.190.3; Taitti. Brāhmaṇa 3.1.4.; ऋषीणां नामधेयानि याश्च वेदेषु दृष्टयः। शर्वर्यन्ते प्रसूतानां तान्येवैभ्यो ददात्यजः॥ यथर्तुष्वृतुलिङ्गानि नानारूपाणि पर्यये। दृश्यन्ते तानि तान्येव तथा भावा युगादिषु॥ यथाभिमानिनोऽतीतास्तुल्यास्ते साम्प्रतैरिह। देवा देवैरतीतैर्हि रूपैर्नामभिरेव च॥ quoted in Ibid.

2. Śāmkarabhā. 1.3.3.

3. न चेयं परमार्थविषया सृष्टिश्रुतिः अविद्याकल्पितनामरूपव्यवहारगोचरत्वात् ब्रह्मात्मभावप्रतिपादनपरत्वाच्चेत्येतदपि नैव विस्मर्तव्यम्। Ibid. 2.1.33; Cf. देवस्यैष स्वभावोऽयमाप्तकाम

mere sportfulness may be illustrated by the recreation, in places of amusement, princes or highly prosperous persons, who have no unfulfilled desires and, hence, none extraneous purpose whatsoever. The activity of the Lord, the Omniscient and Omnipotent Brahman, may be supposed to be mere sport proceeding from His own nature just like the process of inhalation and exhalation in the body. Brahman being omniscient and omnipotent cannot be said to have a desire unfulfilled, hence, the need for justifying His activity even without a selfish motive, is understandable in the Śāmkaravedānta.[1]

III. The Bhāskara[2] School

Brahman and The Concept of Causation

The Brahman or ultimate reality manifests Himself

---

1. Śāmkarabhā. 2.1.33. Mā. Kā. 1.9.

2. Liberal help has been taken from the material information contained in वेदान्त में भक्ति का स्थान तथा उनके ब्रह्मसूत्र-भाष्य की आलोचनात्मक समीक्षा (D.Phil. thesis of the Allahabad University) by Dr. Shail Kumari in writing this section.

through all the effects or the created universe.[1] This is called the transformation or change (pariṇāma) pertaining to the Brahman.[2] Thus the created universe being the pariṇāma of Brahman has identical and hence essential as well as real existence along with its material cause viz., the Brahman.[3] In this manner the 'one' ultimate principle or reality (i.e. Brahman) has been described as having 'two' aspects or states[4] viz., the one essential or causal (svarūpāvasthā) and the other pertaining to the effects (kāryāvasthā), and cause and effect (as two aspects of the one principle) constitute the concept of unity (abheda), and the independent reality of the

---

1. परमात्मा स्वयमात्मानं कार्यत्वेन परिणामयामास Bhāskarabhā. (Ed. Vindhyeśvarīprasad Dwivedi, Chow. San. Se. 1903); Cf. तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत Taitti. Up. 2.7.
2. ब्रह्मपरिणतेरिति [illegible] Nyāyakusumāñjali 2.3.332; 'The philosophy of Bhedābheda pariṇāma is the principle of self-differenciation of Brahman or the real limiting adjuncts or upādhis that inhere in Brahman.' Cf. The Philosophy of Bhedābheda by P.N. Srinivasacarya referred to in वेदान्त में भास्कर का स्थान तथा उनके ब्रह्मसूत्र-भाष्य की आलोचनात्मक समीक्षा, p 2-8.
3. परिणामो नाम उपादानसमसत्ताककार्यापत्तिः, विवर्तो नाम उपादानविषमसत्ताककार्यापत्तिः Vedāntaparibhāṣā by Dharmarājādhvarīndra (Ed. Ananda Jha, Akhila Bhāratīya Sanskrit Parishad, Lucknow, pp. 37-38).
4. परमात्मनोऽवस्थाविशेषः प्रपञ्चोऽयम् Bhāskarabhā. 2.1.14.

effects as pariṇāmas side by side with the above - mentioned monism constitute the concept of difference (bheda)-in the concept of causation according to this school. The Brahman has unthinkable and infinite powers (śaktis) which He reflects externally out of Himself during the process of creation and during existence as well as draws inwards within Himself at the end during the process of dissolution, in a periodic cycle just as the sun does in respect of its rays in the morning and the evening.[1] The universe as effect (pariṇāma) caused by the Brahman,[2] consists of the category of subjective, conscious and experiencing souls (jivas) on the one hand as well as of the category of the unconscious objects like the other (ākāśa) etc. The two fold creation as has been ascribed to a similar division of the śaktis of the Lord (or Brahman).[3]

Regarding the nature of causation Bhāskara says

---

1. शक्तिविक्षेपं कृतवान्। अनन्ता हि तस्य शक्तयोऽचिन्त्याश्च। ताभिः विक्षेपं करोति सृष्टिस्थितिकाले यथा सूर्यो रश्मीनाम्। तद्वदेव संहरति Bhāskarabhā. 1.4.25.

2. अयमेव ज्ञान्योर्मते वाक्यकारवृत्तिकाराभ्यां सम्प्रदायमतः समाश्रितः। तथा च कार्यं परिणामस्तु स्याद् दध्यादिवत् Ibid on आत्मकृतेः परिणामात्। Brahmasūtra 1.4.26.

3. शक्तिविक्षेपलक्षणः परिणामः ईश्वरस्य द्वे शक्ती भवतो भोग्यशक्तिरेका भोक्तृशक्तिश्चापरा। या भोग्यशक्तिः सा आकाशादिरूपेणाचेतनपरिणामापत्तेः या भोक्तृशक्तिः सा ... जीवरूपेण तिष्ठते / Bhāskarabhā. 2.1.17.

that the so called components or parts (avayavas) cannot be logically held to belong to the origin of the material cause of the effect.[1]

The cause, having no parts, in the process of production, has been illustrated by the effects such as lust, anger, greed, infatuation etc. produced out of the whole or partless cause viz., the mind (manas) which does not forsake[2] its essential identify or individuality in the process of its natural transformation (or parināma). The apparently or really different waves can, as effects, are produced out of the self-same sea which causes them.[3] Manifests itself as effects due to its own nature (or potency) and also

Bhāskarabhā. 2.1.14;

1. न सावयवत्वं तत्र परिणतिहेतुः। यदि स्यात् अम्भसोऽपि हिमभावेन परिणामः स्यात्। अतोऽप्रयोजकं सावयवत्वम्। ये चावयवानामवयवाः कल्पितास्ते किं परिणमन्ते न वेति। यदि न परिणमेरन् रूपान्तरं न दृश्येत। तस्मात् सर्वेषामवयवानां परिणामित्वमेष्टव्यम् किं सावयवानामवयवकल्पने प्रयोजनम्। ... स्यात् अवयवानामानन्त्यात्। Ibid; तस्मान्निरवयवस्यैव परिणामो दृश्यते Ibid.

2. अप्रच्युतस्वरूपस्य शक्तिविशेषलक्षणः परिणामो यथा तन्तुनाभस्य पटतन्तुमत्। पटवत्। यथा अप्रच्युतस्वरूपाणां तन्तूनां प्रावरणावस्थानम्। यथा-काशात् अप्रच्युतस्वभावाद्वायुः संभवते। Ibid. 2.1.14.

न च निरवयवस्य परिणामो नास्ति। यथा मनसः कामक्रोधलोभमोहादयः परस्परविलक्षणाः समुद्रोर्मय इवोद्भवन्ति। मनः स्वरूपं चाप्रच्युतम्। Ibid. 2.1.14.

न सावयवत्वं तत्र परिणतिहेतुः। यदि स्यात् अम्भसोऽपि परिणाम... हि ... परिणाम ... Ibid.

without losing its essential identity or unity even in the created state.[1] Thus the 'one' omniscient, omnipotent Brahman, too, transforms Himself into the created universe at His will and merely due to His very svabhāva or inherent śaktis.[2]

Then, Brahman is both the material[3] (upādān) as well as the efficient (nimitta) cause of the creation of the universe[4], because He alone is called cause and effect in different states or aspects of existence viz. the unmanifest and the manifest, just like 'the' banyan tree as an effect is produced by and out of its self-same seed state. Just like the jar or necklace etc. are,

---

1. ब्रह्मणः स्वस्य शक्तिविक्षेपलक्षणः परिणामो Ibid. 2.1.14; अतः ब्रह्मात्मकोऽपि नास्त्यप्रपञ्चो न प्रपञ्चात्मकं ब्रह्म। Ibid. 3.2.11; [illegible] प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मात्मता न प्रपञ्चात्मता ब्रह्मणः। Ibid. 3.2.13.
2. परिणामस्वाभाव्यात् क्षीरवत् सर्वज्ञस्य सर्वशक्तियुक्तस्य स्वेच्छया परिणमेतात्मानम्, Ibid. 2.1.14; स हि स्वेच्छया स्वात्मानं लोकहितार्थं परिणमयन् [illegible] परिणामयति। Ibid.
3. Cf. [illegible] उपादानकारणत्वं [illegible]। Ibid. 1.3.28;
4. प्रकृतिरुपादानकारणं च ब्रह्माभिनिमित्तकारणं च Ibid. 1.4.22; The help of material or instrumental causes, as evident in the case of worldly conscious agents (e.g. in the case of the production of the jar or the cloth etc.), are not required in the phenomenon of universal creation, because, in the first place, the Brahman is omnipotent (Cf. परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते Śveta. 1.3) and omniscient (Cf. यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्),

and, also because manifestation or creation is His very nature or innate potentiality. Cf. ब्रह्म स्वत एव परिणमते स्वाभाव्यात्, यथा क्षीरं दधिभावाय अम्भो हिमभावाय। Bhās. 2.1.24; The Supreme Conscious Being can create even unconscious and varied ※ objects etc without outer material. Cf. यथा देवा महर्षयः [illegible] विचित्राणि [illegible] योगिनश्च [illegible] etc. Ibid 2.1.25.

only different states or manifestations as effects of the lump of clay or gold et cetera as causes respectively, similarly the created universe consisting the of conscious and the unconscious beings, is the manifested state as effect of the original or causal unmanifested state of the one Brahman.[1]

---

is His very nature or innate potentiality. Cf. ब्रह्म स्वत एव परिणमते स्वभावसामर्थ्यात् । यथा क्षीरं दधिभावाय अम्भो हिमभावाय । Bhāskarabhā.2.1.24; The Supreme Conscious Being can create even unconscious and of various objects etc. without outer material; Cf. यथा देवा महर्षयः बाह्यसाधननिरपेक्षं विविधकार्याणि [illegible] अणिमाद्यैश्वर्यं प्राप्ताविति योगशास्त्रपुराणादिषु Ibid.1.2.25.

1. बीजमेवाङ्कुराकारेणावस्थान्तरतया परिणमते Ibid. 2.2.26; कारणमेव तां तामवस्थां प्रतिपद्यमानं कार्यमिति गीयते। Ibid. 2.1.18; योऽयं भूतयोनिः कारणात्मा स एव कार्यात्मनावस्थितम् [illegible]; कारणमेव कार्यात्मना घटवदवतिष्ठते। Ibid 2.1.[illegible] Ibid.1.2.23; [illegible] Ibid [illegible] कारणात्मना [illegible] कार्यम् Ibid.; कार्यात्मना चावस्थितम्। Ibid.1.1.4;

Cf. तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः । Brahmasū.2.1.14 [illegible] ... कार्यम् [illegible] ... कारणात्मना कार्यात्मना चावस्थितम् । Bhāska. [illegible] 1.4.

Creation from the essentially intact or self-same cause viz. the ātmā or Brahman (as, for example, in the case of that of the objects of dream) is also supported by the scriptures[1] in addition to the ordinary examples from our worldly experience (e.g. that of curd from the milk).[2]

One may object that the milk is found entirely or totally changed in its state of production viz. that of the curd and it no longer exists as a separate identity. To this, Bhaskara replies, that all the features or details of any illustration are never

---

1. न कृत्स्नप्रसक्तिर् अप्रच्युतस्वरूपं ब्रह्म परिणमेत्। कथं। श्रुतेः। सेयं देवतैक्षत हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवता इति तेजोऽन्नव्यतिरिक्तां परां देवतां दर्शयति। शब्दप्रमाणत्वाच्चास्यार्थस्य न स्वविकल्पेन चालयितुं शक्यते। Ibid. 2.1.[illegible]; न तत्र रथा न रथयोगा न पन्थानो भवन्त्यथ रथान्रथयोगान् पथः सृजते। Brh. 4.3.10;

2. Bhāskarbhā. 2.1.14;

implied or acceptable in the original case. Further, we do not find similarity of śakti in the various cases even in our worldly experience. In fact to grasp or determine the order of the infinite creative capacity or variety of the causal energy (pariṇāma śakti) of the Supreme Lord is well nigh impossible for ordinary human beings.[1]

Thus, it is asserted that at the stage of the creation of the unconscious (acetana or jaḍa) physical elements (bhūtas) the Brahman exists separately as a conscious being.[2]

The Order of Creation

The order of Creation according to Bhāskara is as follows:

First of all, after determining the right time for the fruitification of the soul's destiny the Omnipotent God (or

---

1. न हि सर्वात्मना दृष्टान्तसाधर्म्यं किञ्चिदुपपद्यते। यथा तावदचेतनानामेव परस्परं परिणामवैचित्र्यम्। क्षीरस्यैकः परिणामो व्यवस्था। अन्नस्यानेकः ... न हि भावानां शक्तयः केनचित् परिणामो व्यवस्थाप्येत। Ibid. 2.1.14;

2. आत्मनः आकाशः सम्भूतस्तत्तेजोऽसृजतेत्यचेतनं महाभूतं सृजति स्वयं चेतनत्वेन पृथगेवावस्थितः Ibid. 2.1.14;

प्राकृतबुद्धिना परिच्छेत्तुं शक्यते - किमुत चेतनस्य सर्वज्ञस्य सर्वेश्वरस्य स्वतन्त्रस्य

Brahman for that matter) creates the unmanifest (avyākṛta) pure-element, viz., the ether (ākāśa).[1] Later, He produces the Hiraṇyagarbha[2] and having created Him He enters into Him[3] and as such goes on creating the gross bhūtas out of the sūkṣmabhūtas until the creation of the vast universe (brahmāṇḍa) has been finally achieved.[4]

After having created the sūkṣmabhūtas and the Hiraṇyagarbha, Brahman produces the gross (sthūla) ākāśa,[5] from which is produced the air (vāyu) together with

---

1. Ākāśa is indicative (upalakṣaṇa) here for all the five elements.

2. यः पूर्वस्मिन् कल्पे एवैकत्वभावनया प्रजापतिरहं भविष्यामीति कर्मकृतवान् स हिरण्यगर्भ उच्यते। Bhāskara Bh. G. 12. 28.

3. Cf. the concept of anupraveśa in the Upaniṣads (?).

4. स च सर्वज्ञः प्राणिनामुपभोगकालं ज्ञात्वा प्रथमं भूतसूक्ष्माण्यव्याकृताकाशं सृजति तदनन्तरं हिरण्मयं हिरण्यगर्भं तस्मिन्ननुप्रविश्य तदात्मना स्थित्वा ब्रह्माण्डं सृष्ट्वा ततः स्थावरपर्यन्तं सृजति प्राणिनां कर्मानुरूपेण। Bhāskara Chā. Kārikā 1. 30.

5. (i) It is to be noted that the quality and the substance in which it inheres are non-different according to this school, hence by the creation of ākāśa etc. we should take that the qualities, viz., śabda etc. respectively have also been invariably created. Cf. न च गुणादीनां पृथगुत्पत्तिर्वक्तव्या द्रव्योत्पत्तौ तदुत्पत्तिसिद्धेस्तदनन्यत्वाद्यथा घटोत्पत्तौ तद्गुणानामपि जन्मोक्तं भवति। भास्करभा० 2. 3. 9 Bhāskarabhā. 2. [illegible]
Also, the above view is quite different from [illegible] the [illegible]. Cf. प्रथमे क्षणे निर्गुणं [illegible] उत्पद्यते [illegible] गुणानां [illegible] | Tarkabhāṣā [illegible]
(ii) Though partless, it is an effort or manifestation [illegible] like that found in the activities (e.g. [illegible] etc.) of the mind. Cf. [illegible] Bhāskarabhā. 2. 3. 7.

sound or (śabda) and touch (or sparśa) its own quality. Fire or heat (tejas) is produced from vāyu and the former is possessed of form (or rūpa in addition to śabda and sparśa, belonging to its immediate cause). Next are produced in the same manner the water (jala) from teja[1] and the earth (pṛthvī) from jala[2] respectively. It is evident[3] from the above that the last named gross element possesses all the five qualities viz. śabda, sparśa, rūpa, rasa and gandha inherently and naturally. Actually[4] the Brahman in his function of having entered into permeated the ākāśa etc., creates the vāyu etc. in the above order. We have, thus, seen the

---

1. Bhāskarabhā.2.3.11.
2. Ibid.2.3.12.
3. यद्येन ब्रह्मणा व्यवहारार्थमेकगुणं नभो द्विगुणो वायुस्त्रिगुणोऽग्निश्च-
   तुर्गुणं च जलं पञ्चगुणा अवनिर्रचिता। भास्करभाष्य 2. 2. 16.
4. The Brahman is spoken of as having created the tejas for example, तत्तेजोऽसृजत Chā. 6.2.3; स एव परमेश्वरस्तेन तेना-
   त्मनावतिष्ठमानस्तांस्तान् विकारान् सृजति । Bhāskarabhā.2.3.12;
   तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत् Taitt. 2.6; [illegible]
   [illegible] तत्तेज ऐक्षतेति
   उपचर्यते । न [illegible] Bhāskarabhā.
   2.3.13.

creation of the physical universe.

We are told, that, out of the traditional four kinds of bodies or organisms the svedaja and the sthāvara are not born due to the interaction of the male and female beings.[1] The triplication of the physical elements for the manifestations of so many forms (including these four types of bodies of beings as well as those of the inanimate objects) called by the various names in the created universe is said to be done by the Supreme Being (Brahman) Himself who has reentered or pervaded their (i.e. that of tejas, jala and pṛthivī respectively) whole existence after creating them, as the jīvas.[2]

The popular[3] orthodox view of the periodicity or cyclic order of creation and the dissolution following have been accepted in this school of Vedānta as

---

1. योषित्संबन्धव्यतिरेकेण स्वेदजस्थावरयोर्दर्शनात् Ibid. 3.1.20.

2. तत्र तेजोऽबन्नानां सृष्टिमभिधाय। सेयं देवतैक्षत हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवता अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि तासां त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणि। (छान्दो० 6.3.2-3) / Ibid 3.4.20.

3. Cf. Ṛgveda 10.190.3.

well.[1] But, dissolution does not mean total annihiliation[2] of all the created universe rather it means that all this exists in the self-same (svarūpaniṣṭha) cause in its unmanifested condition or state[3] viz., Brahman in minute or unmanifest form during that period.

The order of dissolution (upasaṃhara) of the universe is believed to be the reverse of that of its creation. Thus the last in order of creation is dissolved first and so on and so forth.[4] The inevitable supposition as in most of the orthodox schools is that the effect dissolves into the same material cause out of which it is produced or created. To

---

1. समानरूपत्वात् कल्पान्तरातीतैरिन्द्रादिभिः कल्पादौ सृज्यमानानां तुल्यनामरूपत्वं गम्यते दर्शनात् स्मृतेश्च। Bhāskarabhā.1.3.30
2. न हि प्रलयो नामात्यन्तविनाशो विप्रेयते। सर्पुरुषावस्थायामिव सूक्ष्मतापत्तिमात्रम्। Ibid.1.3.30; Cf. सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्। Chā.6.2.1.
3. स इदं परमेश्वरः सृष्टावस्थायां प्रविभक्तनामरूपं विकारजातं कार्यम् इव, प्रलयावस्थायां स्वात्मनि प्रलीनं अविभक्तम् इव। Ibid.2.1.14
4. उत्पत्तिक्रमाद् विपर्ययेण प्रातिलोम्येन प्रलयक्रमो द्रष्टव्यः। Bhāskarabhā. 2.3.14;

3. यथेदं जगदभिव्यक्ति पुनः [illegible] तस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि प्रतिष्ठितः [illegible] प्रादुर्भूतं। Bhāskarabhā. [illegible] 3.30
[illegible]

make the account of creation and dissolution throughly appreciable and understood by the ordinary men Bhāskara describes them cyclic acts of universe creatish and dissolution by the Lord (Brahman) on the analogy of the Sun spreading birth and drawing back its infinite rays everyday.

The Purpose of Creation

Not even pools act without purpose.[1] The creative activity of the Lord (Supreme Being or Brahman) is due to mere sport.[2] The main practical purpose before Him is the good of the infinite beings[3] (or jivas) which lies in their experience (bhoga) of pleasure and pain according to their past deed (karmas) through the vast variety of the things of the universe only. The mighty Brahman is preempted by an independant desire to serve the above purpose according to His powers.[4] Thus, according to this school, the act of creation by the Supreme Being serves the purpose of worldly usage and practical experiences as we have them.

---

1. See the common saying: प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्य न मन्दो पि प्रवर्त quoted in Bhaskarabha.2.1.32.
2. Br.Sū.2.1.33.
3. स हि स्वेच्छया स्वात्मानं लोकहितार्थं परिणामयन् स्वशक्त्यनुसारेण परिणामयति। Bhaskarabha 2.1.14.
4. Ibid.

IV. The Rāmānuja[1] School

The Concept of Causation

According to Rāmānuja causation does not mean creation of a new substance, it means only a change of states (avasthāpariṇāma) according to which a substance does not lose its identity or essentiality, but only assumes different states or modes. Before creation and after dissolution the manifold conscious (cit) and unconscious (acit or non-living) beings remain in such a subtle form that they might be treated as avyakta or even non-existent. It is this non-difference in the substantiality of the cause and the effect has been explained in the Chāndogyopaniṣad by the well-known episode of Śvetaketu and Uddālaka.[2] The soul, for example, remains in subtle form while associated with God (or Brahman) during the unmanifest or causal state and can be said to become effect in its

1. Liberal help has been taken from the material information contained in Philosophy of Rāmānuja by Dr.K.D.Bharadwaj, in writing this section.

2. Chā.6.1.3-7.

gross state the consciousness of which expands in accordance with the law of Karman and becomes explicit in and through the process of evolution.[1]

Regarding the concept of causality, Rāmānuja has also held that no non-intelligent matter, although apparently seen in some instances to work of itself, can function without the controlling influence of an intelligent principle[2]. This fact can be illustrated by such common knowledge as that of wood never forming itself into the shape of a house or conveyance without the agency of a carpenter.[3] This is the background in which we can fully appreciate the role of the Great Intelligent Person, i.e., God in the theory of creation as propounded by the Rāmānuja school.

<u>God and Creation</u>

The individual souls (jīvas) and matter (prakṛti)

---

1. See <u>Philosophy of Rāmānuja</u> p.93.
2. यत् क्षीरजलादि दृष्टान्ततया निदर्शितं तत्रापि प्रज्ञानाधिष्ठाने प्रवृत्तिर्नोपपद्यते। योऽप्सु तिष्ठन्नित्यादिश्रुतेः Sribhā.2.2.2.
3. काष्ठादेरचेतनस्य तज्ज्ञानाधिष्ठितस्य कार्यारम्भानुपपत्तेर्दर्शनाच्च न ज्ञानानधिष्ठितं प्रधानं कारणम्। Ibid.2.2.1.

are the forms or modes (prakāras) of God[1] (i.e. Brahman or the non-dual reality as qualified by the two) and the process of creation pertaining to them does not envisage a change in His essence (svarūpa). The relationship that subsists between the prakaras and God (prakārin) is explained as that between a body (sarira) and the person (saririn). Just as a saririn is found to be both the efficient and material cause of the nails and hair growing or evolving out of his sarira, God may be accepted as both the efficient and material cause of the universe.[2]

The process of evolution and dissolution mainly takes place in prakṛti under the supervision of God.[3] In the case of the jīvas also there is no change

---

1. अतः प्रकृतिप्रकारसंस्थिते परमात्मनि प्रकारभूतप्रकृत्यंशे विकारः प्रकार्यंशे चाविकारः [illegible]

2. Mm. गौरीशंकर हीराचन्द ओझा has erroneously attributed to Rāmānuja the view that God is only the efficient cause of the universe, while the jīvas are its material cause. Cf. His मध्यकालीन भारतीय संस्कृति (1928) पृ. 97

3. मदीया प्रकृतिः मदध्यक्षत्वेन मयाध्यक्षेणैव सचराचरं जगत् सूयते।
Gītābhāṣya, [illegible]

as to their essence but the evolution (a-virbhava) only means either contraction (samkosa) or expansion (vikasa) of consciousness.[1]

In this way God is held by Ramanuja to be both the material as well as the efficient cause of creation.[2] Creation, then, can be described, according to him, as the evolutionary change taking place in both the animate and the inanimate beings which are the modes (or characterstics) of the Personal Creator who acts as the material as well as the efficient cause.

The Process of Creation

According to Ramanuja the Supreme Person (or God) remembers at the termination of the period of dissolution (pralaya) the composition of the previous

---

1. [illegible]आत्मधर्मभूतस्य चैतन्यस्य स्वाभाविकस्यापि कर्मणा पारमार्थिकं संकोचं विकासं च ब्रुवताम्। वेदार्थ संग्रह पृ. 73।
ज्ञानानन्दादिगुणानां कर्मणात्मनि संकुचितानां परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य कर्मक्षये विकासस्याविर्भावो वा नानुपपन्नः। Sribha.4.4.3.

2. न निमित्तकारणमात्रं ब्रह्म उपादानकारणं च ब्रह्मैव। Sribha.1.4

universe will he become manifold, and creates it.[1] This process of creation and dissolution goes on beginninglessly and the cycle never ends. Upon God's Will Prakṛti at its primeval unmanifest (avyakta) stage, first of all produces the mattatwa[2] (the Great Principle) which produces the three-fold ahaṁkāra viz., sattvika (or vaikārika), rajas (or taijasa) and tamasa (or bhūtādi). Next, the eleven organs, comprising of the five organs of knowledge viz., ear, skin, eyes, tongue (as an organ of taste) and nose, the five organs of action viz. tongue (as an organ of speech), hands, feet, anus, the generative organ, and the organ of mind (or the inner sense). The process of the evolution of the gross elements produces the sabdatanmātra[3] from

---

1. स भगवान् पुरुषोत्तमः प्रलयावसानसमये पूर्ववत् संस्थानं जगत् स्मरन् बहु स्यामिति संकल्प्य ... महदादिब्रह्माण्डान्तं हिरण्यगर्भपर्यन्तं यथापूर्वं सृजति।

   [illegible], 1.3.2.

2. It has been pointed out that Rāmānuja's system believes in the existence of a 'prāpta Prakṛti' an intermediary condition of Prakṛti in between its avyakta and mahat forms. Cf. Tattwatraya (acitprakaraṇa) by Lokācārya.

3. It may be noted that the process of evolution herein differs from that of the Sāṁkhyayoga school in as much as, according to the latter, the tāmasa aspect of ahaṁkāra (called also the bhūtādi in the former) simultaneously produces

which are likewise produced all the following in successive order, viz. the ākāśa, the sparśa tanmātra, vāyu, rūpatanmātra, agni, rasatanmātra, jala, gandhatanmātra and pṛthvi.[1]

Then, this God (parabrahman) produces the cosmic egg (brahmāṇḍa) after having intermixed or

---

the five tanmātras which is in their turn respectively produce the five bhūtas. Cf. पंचभ्यः पंचभूतानि (S.K. 22) तस्मादपि षोडशकगणपञ्चभ्यः पंचभ्यस्तन्मात्रेभ्यः पंचभूतान्याकाशादीनि। तत्र शब्दतन्मात्रादाकाशं शब्दगुणम्। शब्दतन्मात्रसहितात् स्पर्शतन्मात्राद्वायुः शब्दस्पर्शगुण etc. T.Kau. on ibid. The present school, however, seems to uphold the testimony of the scriptural statement regarding the creation of ākāśa alone in the beginning and then that of the other bhūtas in succession. This also demonstrates the extreme value that the exponents attached to the Vedas. (Cf. Tai. 2.1)

1. तामसाहंकारस्य भूतात् भूतादिसंज्ञकात्तामसाहंकाराच्छब्दादिपञ्चतन्मात्राण्या-काशादिपंचभूतानि चोत्पद्यन्ते इत्यादि। Yatīndramatadīpikā 4; भूतादिस्तु विकुर्वाणः शब्दतन्मात्रकं ततः। ससर्ज शब्दतन्मात्रादाकाशं शब्द-लक्षणम्। शब्दमात्रं तथाकाशं भूतादिः स समावृणोत्। आकाशस्तु विकुर्वाणः स्पर्शमात्रं ससर्ज ह।। बलवानभवद् वायुस्तस्य स्पर्शो गुणो मतः। आकाशं शब्दमात्रं तु स्पर्शमात्रं समावृणोत्। Viṣṇupurāṇa 1.2.37 et. Seq.

triplicated the three elements of earth (prthvi), water (jala), and fire (agni)[1]. According to Yatindramatadipika,[2] however, this triplication suggests quintuplication (pañcikarana)[3] of the elements (bhutas) as well.[4] One element predominates in each of the gross or conglomerate elements (sthūlabhūtas) and hence, the particular name viz. ākāsa etc. is retained in each case.[5]

---

1. त्रिवृत्करणं चतुर्मुखस्याण्डान्तर्वर्तिनो न सम्भवति; त्रिवृत्कृते तेजोबन्नैरण्डस्योत्पद्यते, चतुर्मुखस्य चाण्डे सम्भवः इत्यण्डान्तर्वर्तिनो ब्रह्मा सर्वलोकपितामह इति। अतस्त्रिवृत्करणं परस्यैव ब्रह्मण-स्तत्समानकर्तृकं नामरूपव्याकरणं च तस्यैव विधीयते Sribhā. 2.4.17

2. श्रुते त्रिवृत्करणोपदेशस्तु पञ्चीकरणस्याप्युपलक्षणम्। Yatindra.4.

3. According to this well-known concept of orthodox ~~~~~ Indian Philosophy (1) the five bhūtas in their entirety are divided into equal halves and one half of each bhūta is kept aside, (2) whereas the second half is subdivided into four parts and, (3) lastly, each of the latter parts of a bhūta ~~are~~ is mixed with the greater (i.e. half) part of the other four bhūtas.

~~4.~~ 5. तेषाम् तत्तन्नामत्वात्। ~~Siddhantasiddhanjana p.43~~ Sr. S 2.4.19

~~5.~~ 4. पञ्चीकरणं सप्तीकरणं च पुराणप्रसिद्धम्। Siddhāntasiddhāñjana p.43; [illegible] ब्रह्मणः [illegible] भूतानि भित्त्वा [illegible]

That the names and forms of this world are the same in every creation is a fact mentioned by Bādarāyaṇa himself.[1]

<u>The Purpose of creation</u>

Rāmānuja agrees with the interpretation of Śaṁkara on this aspect of the theory of creation.[2] According to his school, then, at the beginning of creation God (the Puruṣottama) wills to become manifold out of the motive of mere sport (līlā) which prompts Him in the act of creation.[3] Thus He fashions the universe by His mere will. He is busy in the affairs of the world just as a great ruler is while arranging a game simply for his amusement. The manifold creation consists of

---

1. समाननामरूपत्वाच्चावृत्तावप्यविरोधो दर्शनात् स्मृतेश्च। Br. Sū. 1.3.29;
Cf. धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत् Rg. 10.190.3.

2. सापेक्षो हीश्वरो विषमां सृष्टिं निर्मिमीते। किमपेक्षत इति चेत् धर्माधर्मावपेक्षत इति वदामः। अतः सृज्यमानप्राणिधर्माधर्मापेक्षा विषमा सृष्टिरिति नायमीश्वरस्यापराधः। Śaṁkarabhā. 2.1.34.

3. अवाप्तसमस्तकामस्य परिपूर्णस्य लीलैव प्रयोजनम्। Śrībhā. 2.1.33.

the beings of various types viz., high, middle and low. But, God is not a despot open to the charge of cruelty and partiality because inequalities or impurities of the created universe depends upon the deeds of the individual souls.[1]

V. The Nimbārka[2] school

The Concept of Causation

It would not be out of place, perhaps, first of all to point out that according to this school[3] reality consists of two categories (1) independent (svatantra) under which Brahman alone is mentioned, and (2) the dependent (partantra) which again, is of two kinds (a) conscious relating under which comes individual self (jiva) alone, and (b) the non-conscious reality—

---

1. सृज्यमानदेवादिवैषम्यं कर्मसापेक्षत्वादित्यवमुष्टेः।

   Ibid.2.1.34.

2. Libreral help has been taken from the material information contained in Nimbārka School of Vedānta by Umesh Mishra, in writing this section.

3. Dasasloki, verse 3.

under which comes (i) the products of the primordial cause or prakṛti known as the prakṛta, (ii) the reality not pertaining to prakṛti known as aprakṛta and (iii) time (kāla).

Nimbārka believes in satkaryavāda[1] because even prior to creation or manifestation, as well as after dissolution or extinctions, the effect in the form of the universe, exists in the Brahman (or Lord) the cause[2]. He cites several scriptural statements to support his contention[3]. It is said, thus, that people desirous of producing curd, jar, a necklace (rucaka) etc. definitely use milk, clay and gold as their respective material cause. This restriction of choice of the material cause is possible only because the effect is essentially present in its cause. For example, to illustrate the reverse case, no body has ever seen the sprouting of the barley-plant from firy particles, where the former is entirely absent.[4] Therefore, we can say that this universe is real (sat) like its own material cause, viz. God

---

1. Kau.2.1.16;
2. Chā.6.2.1; Ibid.6.2.3; Ibid.6.1.4; Ibid 6.2.3; Ibid.6.8.7; Ibid.3.14.1; Bṛhadā.1.4.7; Aitareyāraṇyaka 2.4; Ibid.1.1;
3. Kau.2.1.17
4. Cf.B.G.2.16.

(parameśvara), from which it is both apparently different as well as essentially identical.[1] The universe with forms, as effect, is a modification (pariṇāma) of the Brahman as cause, in which the former remains without forms prior to creation or production.[2] However, Śrīnivāsa expressly mentions that this pariṇāma is nothing, but the potency or power of projection belonging to the Lord, and that it can not mean the independent or unsupervised changes by prakṛti, as in the Sāmkhyayoga system.[3] The Nimbārka school believes in the mutual distinctness and identity (bhedābheda) of the Paramātman, the individual self (jīva), and the material universe (jagat).[4] However, the identity (abheda) with the Brahman of the conscious realities (jīvas) suggests only that their existence, activities etc.[5] are dependent

---

1. Ibid.2.1.19;
2. Ibid.3.2.27;
3. See Nimbārka School of Vedānta p.110.
4. Vedāntapārijātasaurabha and Kau. ~~on the Sūtra, on Br.Sū.~~ 3.2.27; Ibid.1.2.8; Ibid.1.4.20;
5. See the section on the role of nescience in the form of past deeds later on.

on Him, and that of the non-conscious realities likewise means only that these come out of Him.[1] The non-identity with the Brahman of the jivas is deduced from the fact that Brahman is not the doer of deeds or experiencer of the resulting pain etc., and is independent, omniscient and the controller of all while the jivas are just the opposite.[2] Also the non-identity of the non-conscious realities with their cause (viz. the Brahman) has been explained on the analogy of the difference in form (and not in essence) as found between the effect and the adamantive itself which is its cause or on that found to exist between the waves (as effects) and the ocean (as cause of the former).[3]

God and Creation

God possesses the following six qualities which He makes use of for creating the universe: (1) Knowledge (jnana) through which he directly perceives everything of every place and of all the times; (2) Power (sakti) through which He makes possible what is impossible

1. Kau.2.1.21
2. Sam and Kau.2.1.20
3. B.S. along with Sam. and Kau.2.1.22; Ibid.2.1.13

(3) Strength (bala) with which He supports the entire universe; (4) Supremacy (aiśvarya) by which He controls everything, (5) Energy (tejas) due to which He never feels tired although there is much to cause weariness; and (6) Prowess (vīrya) through which He can subdue everything without himself being suppressed.[1]

The whole universe including the intellect, themind the gross, air, the fire, the water, the ether, the earth and the four types of beings (viz. the viviparous (jarāyuja), oviparous (aṇḍaja), sweat-born (svedaja) and those born by germinating (udbhij)) are all ever present in the all-pervasive[2] God[3] Who is the eternal deer, is present in the heart of the beings as their controller, and Who is Bliss[4] (ānanda) and, as such the source of ānanda to all the other jīvas.[5] Then, it is due to His ever-present nature (svabhāva[6]) that the svabhāvas of the jīvas are manifested.[7]

---

1. Vedāntaratnamañjuṣā pp.44-45; Sau and Kau.1.2.2.
2. Sau.1.2.10; ibid 3.2.11,19,30; cf. also Br.Sū.3.2.22.
3. Mañju.pp.43-47; He is the form of all (sarvarūpa). Cf. Kau.3.2.30.
4. Br.Sū.1.2.15; Sau. and Kau. on ibid.
5. Sau.1.1.13,15
6. Cf.Br.Sū.1.3.19
7. Sau.1.3.20

Besides, even the various dream-cognitions for fixed durations are created[1] by God in accordance with the merits and demerits of the jivas[2].

He is the source of all creation[3] and, it is out of Him that the elements or beings (bhūtāni) come to exist, through Him that they have their existence and it is He in whom these retire or dissolve at the end. In other words, the objects or things of the universe always remain connected[4] with the creator during all three states, viz., those of creation, existence and destruction.[5]

---

1. Br.Sū.3.2.27 alongwith Sau.on it.
2. Sau.,Kau. and Prabhā 3.2.4-7 and Śrutyantarasurad p.200 (referred to on p.27 of <u>Nimbārka School of Vedānta</u>)
3. अथाचिन्त्यविविधसंस्थानसम्पन्नस्यासंख्येयनामरूपादिविशेषाश्रयस्य विविधरूपस्य विश्वस्य सृष्टिस्थितिलया यस्मात् सार्वज्ञ्याद्यनन्तगुणाश्रयात् ब्रह्मणोऽकालादिनियन्तु- र्भगवतो भवन्ति तदेव पूर्वोक्तनिर्वचनविषयं ब्रह्म।
सत्कार्यं जगत्कारणं प्रकृत्य स्वप्नान्तं मे सोम्य विजानीहीति यत्रैतत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सोम्य तदा सम्पन्नो भवतीत्यादिनोक्तस्याप्ययस्य चेतनसम्बन्धिनो ब्रह्मण्येव सम्भवात् ब्रह्मैव जगत्कारणं युक्तम्
Sau.1.1.10; Kau.1.14.
4. ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति। भ्रामयन् सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि मायया (B.G.18.61); मत्तः परतरं नान्यत् किञ्चिदस्ति धनञ्जय। मयि सर्वमिदं प्रोतं सूत्रे मणिगणा इव।।
Ibid.7.7.
5. Taitti.3.1.

Thus, God, according to this school, is the material (upādāna) as well as the affiecient (nimitta) cause of creation.[1] As such, He is said to possess a physical body of His own,[2] which is not made up of the products of the primordial matter, and He manifests in grosser form His natural potencies and their real effects in the form of conscious and unconscious entities, on the one hand (i.e. being the upādānakarana), as well as, connects the conscious

---

1. Cf. Br.Sū. alongwith Sau.1.4.27; ibid.2.1.8; Chā.6.2.3; ब्रह्म वनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीत् etc. Taitti.Brā. 2.8.9.6. (quoted in Sau.1.4.25); Taitti. Up.2.7; Mañjū p.65.

2. Kau.1.1.21; Cf. also Cha.8.6.4. quoted in ibid; Tattwapra on B. C. 4.6; Mañjū.p.72.

beings (who have no knowledge of the beginningless past deeds and the disposition caused or created by themselves) with the means of experiencing the fruits due of pleasure and pain etcetera thereof (i.e. of their karmans and saṁskāras), by giving them the required amount or degree of knowledge (implying creation amount of nescience as well)[1], on the other hand (i.e. being the nimittakāraṇa).

God has infinite forms[2], which have been grouped into two categories: (1) the specific forms (vyūhas) which He assumes for creating the universe and for making Himself accessible to the devotees, and (2) the incarnations (avatāras) which He assumes for upholding the virtues and righteousness against the overwhelming onslaughts of the vices and wickedness.

In the former category, mention is made of

1. See the section on the role of nescience later on.

of (i) Vasūdeva or Ksetrajña which is the Lord Himself in His attributes aspect; (ii) Samkarsana or antaryāmin which is the individual self in all the beings, (iii) Pradumna which is the mind (manas) in all the beings and which does not dissolve even during the universal dissolution (Pralaya) and (iv) Aniruddha which is manifested out of or produced from (v) above, at the beginning of the process of creation, and which creates entire all the animate and the inanimate beings of the universe.

In the latter category mention is made of (i) gunāvatāra which controls the three gunas and thus cause the creation, production and destruction of the universe, and in whose functioning time (kāla) which is His own form (svarūpa) also plays an important role; (ii) purusāvatāra which is of three kinds viz., (a) that which controls the primordial cause (i.e. prakrti) which evolves Buddhi etc. and takes rest when He sleeps in the causal ocean, (b) that which is the controller of all beings (samasti),

takes rest in the eternal interior water (garbhoda) and (c) that which controls the individual beings (i.e. their vyaṣṭi) and sleeps in the ocean of milk, and (iii) līlāvatāra which is of two kinds viz., (1) āveśāvatāra which is, either (a) svāṁśāveśa i.e. that of the infusion of the Lord's own self into a physical organism made up of Prakṛti directly without having the jīva as an intervention, or (b) śaktyaṁśāveśa wherein the Supreme Lord infuses His potency (śakti) in varying degrees in the physical organisms having the jīvas as interventions, and (2) svarūpāvatāra which is of two kinds viz., (a) aṁśarūpa wherein the Lord present in the physical organism does not manifest His full powers, qualities etcetera, and (b) pūrṇarūpa wherein the Lord manifests His full powers, qualities etcetera e.g. in the incarnations of Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Nṛsiṁha etcetera.

The Roles of Nescience and Unseen force in creation

The manifestation of the nature (svarūpa) of māyā (or avidyā) like all other realities, is dependent on the Lord.[1] The knowledge or wisdom of jīva or the doer[2] is screened by the nescience (avidyā) or unwisdom

---

1. Sam.1.3.20
2. Br.Sū.2.3.33 alongwith Sam., Kau. and Prabhā.

(māyā) in the forms of its past deeds which have no beginning[1] and under whose influence the jīva has to assume[2] a suitable body[3], i.e. that of a god, human being or any other being who is a modification of the primordial matter (prakṛti) and also experience suitable sound, touch, colour, taste and odour which, too, are the modifications of the same prakṛti[4] (under the process of creation with which we shall deal later). For example, some jīvas are spoken of as assuming the bodies produced out of the watery elements present in another bhūta suitable for the moon region. The passage of the jīvas through the ether, air, clouds, etcetera prior to the worldly birth or through the smoky path (dhūmamārga) etcetera after the worldly death, as well as their passage to either the regions of the hell viz., raurava, mahāraurava, vahni, vaitariṇī, kumbhī, tāmisra, and andhatāmisra meant for the experience of pain, or to the pitṛloka etcetera — all this, too, is due to the avidya in the form of the past deeds (pūrvakarmans) of the jīvas. Again, we are

---

1. Vedāntatattvabodha p.12 (referred to on p.42 of Nimbārka School of Vedānta); Kau.1.3.20; Cf.B.G.5.15.
2. The jīva carries along with it the suitable forms of all the elements, viz., the earth etcetera with which its fresh body will be formed in the next region. Cf. Kau.4.2.5.
3. Ibid.1.3.11-12.
4. Kau.1.4.10; Mañjū. p.22.

told that the avidyā of the Lord's favourite souls whose inner senses have been purified, is duly dispelled through meditation etc. before they get liberated.[1]

Thus, the role of avidyā is vital in creation. The righteous and unrighteous deeds do result in the desired and undesired results, but, the unseen force (adṛṣṭa) accruing from the past deeds, too, sometimes causes or leads to the performance of good or bad deeds,[2] and, the indirectly leads to the suitable creation of body etc. for each jīva. In this manner, the doership or the principle of Karman also has a decisive and practical role in creation. In fact, we may safely conclude that both avidyā and adṛṣṭa are rather complementary and necessary not only for the creation of the various unconscious objects of the universe but also for the mundane activities and norms of the created universe.

---

1. For a detailed discussion of the suitable regions, paths, and bodies as are useful for the various kinds of jīvas after death and before next birth according to this School see Nimbārka School of Vedānta pp.56-62 and pp. 77-84.
2. Br.Sū.2.3.36 alongwith Saṃ. and Kau.

The Non-conscious Realities and Creation

We have already[1] indicated the three divisions of non-conscious or unintelligent realities. Here we propose to deal with each of them as part of our study of the theory of creation according to Nimbārka school.

(A) Prākṛta

It is the distinct creative energy of the Lord, but, being dependent for its activities etc. on Him, is, also, not distinct (bhinna) from Him.[2] It remains as śakti in its cause viz., the Brahman or God during the period of dissolution, and at the time of creation alone, manifests from him (Cf. the brahmotapanna), its attributes of sattwa, rajas and tamas and, thereby, transfer itself into the tejas, water and food through the process of creation or modification, and finally, is responsible for the production of the distinct names and forms.[3] In this way, Prakṛti or

---

1. See the section on the concept of causation.

2. Cf.Kau.1.3.21; In fact, its very dependence on the conscious God differentiates the Prakṛti here with its counterpart in Sāmkhyayoga school. Again, as prakṛti is the śakti of the Lord in this school its dependence on God is not like that of the nonconscious atoms in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school. Cf.Kau.1.4.9;

3. Prabhā 1.4.10;

śakti of the independent Lord plays a useful role in creation.[1] The process of the manifestations or creation from the stage of Prakṛti, which is the only unmanifest creative energy of the Lord, in the form of equilibrium of the three guṇas before the beginning of creation, shall be dealt with later on.[2]

(B) Aprākṛta

The aprākṛta realities[3] are not produced from either Prakṛti or its three guṇas and are beyond time (kāla).[4] These are the forms or implements viz. the bodies, bones etc.[5] created by the Lord according to His Divine Will for the experience (bhoga) of Himself as well as the eternally liberated beings.[6]

(C) Kāla[7]

But, during the process of creation (līlāvibhūti) He simply imitates the dependence of kāla. In the

---

1. Br.Sū alongwith Kau.1.4.3.
2. See the section on the process of creation.
3. See p.277 earlier.
4. Mañju p.39;
5. Ibid.
6. Kau.1.1.1.
7. Mañju p.33; Ibid pp.38-39.

Lord's eternal forms (nityavibhūti) there is no influence of kāla. We should, therefore, judge the perspective role of Kāla in the process of creation only in the background of the fact of kāla being His own form (svarūpa). Kāla is partless, and, hence, eternal in its causal aspect, and, as such, continues to exist even during the period of dissolution. Also, it is the material cause of the notions of past, present and future, etcetera which are caused by it. In its above mentioned effects, it is cognised as non-eternal. It is the instrumental cause of creation and dissolution because they take place due to its limitating or determining operation, which, however, invariably and simply consists of the motions in the form of the movements of the Sun.[1] It is interesting to note here, that, the concept of the successive cyclic order of creation and dissolution after a fixed period of time,[2] is in

---

1. The time taken by the sun to cross the space occupied by a paramāṇu is called atomic-time. Cf. the modern concepts of the light-years etc. used in the field of space science.

2. "It is of the nature of light and non-obstruction (anāvarakasvabhāva) its scope is far above that of the Primordial Matter and is also unlimited. It is known as Bliss as it manifests Bliss. It is variously called-nityavibhūti, Eternal Mysterious Powers of the Lord; Paramātmaloka, the Regions of the Paramātman; the Highest Heaven; the Footstep of Viṣṇu." Cf. Nimbārka School of Vedānta p.92.

in conformity with most of the orthodox schools of Indian philosophy.

Because of the overwhelming[1] importance of Kāla in the theory of creation as revealed in the orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy in general, we give below an account of the various divisions of time, as have also been accepted in the Nimbārka School of Vedānta[2]—

"2 Paramāṇus = 1 Dvyaṇuka, 3 Dvyaṇukas = 1 Trasareṇu, 3 Trasareṇus = 1 Truṭi, 100 Truṭis = 1 Vedha, 3 Vedhas = 1 Lava, 3 Lavas = 1 Nimeṣa, 15 Nimeṣas = 1 Kāṣṭhā, 30 Kāṣṭhās = 1 Kalā, 30 Kalās = 1 Muhūrta, 30 Muhūrtas = 1 day of ours, 15 days = 1 Pakṣa, 2 Pakṣas = 1 month, 2 Months = 1 Ṛtu, 6 Months = 1 Ayana, 2 Ayanas = 1 year — the Winter Solstice is the night of the gods, while the summer solstice represents the day of the gods.

---

1. Cf. the concepts of order and periodicity as implied or explicitly accepted in the different theories of creation. It is a well-known fact that Indian Literature (e.g. the Vedas, the śāstras like jyotiṣa, the purāṇas, the kāvyas etc) also testifies to the universal popularity of the above concepts among the masses.

2. Mañjū.p.33; The English rendering is quoted here from Nimbārka School of Vedānta (p.94).

The four *yugas* consist of the Divine 12 thousand years, of which the *Kṛta* covers 4800 thousand years along with the two *Sandhyās*, the tretā covers 3600 thousand years along with the two *Sandhyas*, the Dvāpara covers 2400 thousand years alongwith the two *Sandhyās*, while the *Kali* covers 1200 thousand years alongwith the two *Sandhyās*. This entire period represents one cycle and such 1000 cycles constitute *One Day* of the Caturmukha. Fourteen Manus appear one after another during the single day of the Caturmukha. Seventy-one years make one *Manvantara* which is the period of existence for one Manu. Fourteen times the above measures of time is the day of Brahmā and equal to the same period is the duration of his night. One hundred years according to the above measure of time is the span of life for the Caturmukha. Half of this period of time is called *Parārdha*. The first *Parārdha* is past, and of the second *Parārdha* which is current, the present period is the first *Kalpa*, called the *Vārāhakalpa*."

The Process of Creation

At the beginning of creation the equilibrium of the guṇas is disturbed by the creator God's Will[1] to create the universe in accordance with the adṛṣṭa of the jīvas[2]. Then, the unmanifest eternal premordial matter (Prakṛti) gets manifested or modified into the non-eternal products (vyaktas)[3] in the following order.[4] Mahat (the great principle) is created first of all, and it produces egoism (ahaṁkāra), the latter being of three kinds due to the predominance of one of the three guṇas in each case. The sāttvika or vaikārika aspect of ahaṁkāra produces or manifests the presiding deities, of the five sense-organs and the mind (manas). From rājasika or taijasa ahaṁkāra are manifested the ten external-organs (i.e. both those of sense, and those of action). From the tāmasika or bhūtādi aspect of ahaṁkāra the following are produced in successive order viz., śabdatanmātra, ākāśa, sparśatanmātra, vāyu, rūpatanmātra, tejas, rasatanmātra, jala, gandhatanmātra and pṛthvī. The tanmatras, as we will

---

1. Taitt.Up.2.6; Chā.6.2.3.
2. Mañjū. pp.23-24.
3. Kau.1.1.1.
4. Vedāntaratnamañjūṣa (pp.24-31) gives a very lucid and detailed exposition about all the products of prakṛti (as are being mentioned here) according to this School.

know, are the subtle elements and the ākāśa etcetera are the gross elements (Bhūtas[1]). Thus, pṛthvī has got all the five qualities, jala has only four, tejas has only three, vāyu has only two, while ākāśa has got only one quality as follows from the traditional recognition of the concept that the quality of a cause (e.g., that of sound in the śabdatanmātra) is universally present in the effect (e.g. in the vāyu in the above case). By the way, we may mention that the traditional constitution of the subtle body (sūkṣmaśarīra)[2] by the seventeen of these products viz., the tanmātras, plus manas, plus the 10 indriyas and prāṇa (which never leaves the jīva in the worldly state of bondage and together with which the jīva migrates from one gross body to another) is duly accepted by this school also. The non-eternal[3] gross body (sthūlaśarīra) is, also, likewise, accepted to have been materially caused or produced by the Prakṛti, mahat, ahaṁkāra and the 5 bhūtas. These sthūlaśarīras are produced as a result of the Karmans in the case

---

1. The concept of sūkṣmaśarīra according to the Vedānta, as is being mentioned here, may be compared with that of the Sāṁkhyayoga school, wherein, however, it is regarded to be composed of the 18 principles, viz., buddhi, plus ahaṁkāra, plus the 11 indriyas plus the 5 tanmātras.

1. Although the tanmātras and bhūtas are distinguished, the latter are individually produced from the former and even vice versa, in some cases. This manner eventual appears as quite confusing and, surely, not in conformity with similar tradition of any other orthodox school of Indian Philosophy.

2. The implied acceptance of the process of quintuplication (cf. Nimbārka School of Vedānta p.109) does not, however, appear to be supported by the above description, for,

3. We have referred to the creation of the Aprākṛta bodies etc. of the Lord and the eternally liberated [illegible] on p.208 earlier.

of the traditional four kinds viz. the jarāyuja etcetera, as well as, not as due to them (i.e. karmans) in the case of the bodies (e.g. the one called virāṭ etcetera) as are assumed by the Lord.

The order of dissolution is just the reverse[1] of that of creation, except, that it, too, starts and functions under the Lord's will[2] and causality like the latter does. Thus, the pṛthvī dissolves into the gandhatanmātra, and so on and so forth, till all the products of, in Prakṛti finally dissolve into it. During the period of Prakṛti dissolution the Prakṛti, in the form of śakti, remains in Brahman (or God) which is its cause, and, being unmanifest, it is incapable of differentiating between the name and form which are characteristics of its manifest or productive state.[3]

The Purpose of Creation

As all His desires have been fulfilled, the Lord

---

1. Mañjū. pp.26-27.
2. Kau.1.2.9.
3. Prabhā 1.4.10.

has no more desire for anything.[1] But, since we have seen how creation and dissolution (and, in fact, all the activities of the universe for that matter) are dependent upon His independent Will, the theory of creation reasonably requires there being some purpose or motivation behind His spontaneous[2] and sweet Will.[3] Thus, it is said that He creates the universe only for the purpose of playful activity (līlā) and, hence, injustice and cruelty in respect of the unhappiness etcetera found in the created universe, also, cannot be ascribed to Him.[4] Besides, as we have already seen, He helps the jīvas to have the experience of pleasure and pain in accordance with their past deeds through the act of creation, and, as the avidyā pertaining to the jīvas in the form of the past deeds is endless, there never would be any lack of them (i.e. that of the past deeds) according to which He may create the universe comprising suitable[5] (i) the objects (e.g. food and drink) qualified by the qualities

---

1. Kau.1.2.11; Cf. न मे पार्थास्ति कर्तव्यं त्रिषु लोकेषु किंचन। नानवाप्तमवाप्तव्यं वर्त एव च कर्मणि॥ यदि ह्यहं न वर्तेयं जातु कर्मण्यतन्द्रितः। मम वर्त्मानुवर्तन्ते मनुष्याः पार्थ सर्वशः॥ उत्सीदेयुरिमे लोका न कुर्यां कर्म चेदहम्। संकरस्य च कर्ता स्यामुपहन्यामिमाः प्रजाः॥ B.G.3.22-24.

2. All the qualities of the Lord (including the Will, of course) are natural. Cf. Mañjū. pp.18-19.
3. Br.Sū.2.1.24 alongwith Sau., Kau. and Prabhā.
4. Br.Sū.2.1.21-23 alongwith Sau.
5. Mañjū. p.31.

of sound, touch et cetera; (2) the implements of bhoga viz., the body, the sense-organs, and the mind et cetera; and (3) the place of bhoga viz., the entire universe (brahmāṇḍa)[1] of the 14 regions.[2]

VI. The Mādhva[3] School.

The Concept of Causation

The Mādhva concept of causation can be described as both[4] satkāryavāda and asatkāryavāda. The absolute non-existence of the effect in the cause, according to the latter case, may lead us even to propound that anything[5] can be produced out of nothing, while in the former case, the effect ever being existent, though, in a nascent form, in the cause prior to its manifestation, may also lead to conceive anything as

1. For the orthodox Indian concept of the brahmāṇḍa ... [illegible]
2. According to the ... [illegible]
3. Liberal help has been taken from the material information contained in An Outline of Madhva Philosophy by Dr. K. Narain, in writing this section.
4. According to Padmanābhasūri the Mādhva concept of causation is a middle path between those of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika and the Sāṃkhyayoga Schools (C.f. Madhvasiddhāntasāra). [illegible]
5. Madh. Si. Sā. pp. 93–94.

capable of being produced from anything without any limitations, whatsoever, regarding its nature. In this background, we may appreciate the concept of causation according to the Mādhva philosopher.

Prior to production, the effect exists in the form of the cause, and it is non-existent as an effect, and after its creation, the effect exists in its own form, and is non-existent as cause. The two are, therefore, only different aspects of the same principle of material causality and neither asatkāryavāda nor satkāryavāda by themselves, but, both taken together, are applicable in the concept of causation.

The cause (i.e. being an unconditional and invariable antecedent[1]) which undergoes a real transformation or modification[2] (pariṇāma) of

either quality (i.e. the dharma)[1] or the qualified (i.e. the dharmi)[2] is known as the material cause. The universe, too, as an effect, is created from the unconscious primordial matter (Prakṛti) rather than Brahman[3], as the material cause. Thus, it is held that the Prakṛti or Pradhāna forms the body of the Lord or God, which actually evolves as the created world, and, into which at the time of dissolution the various evolutes dissolve.[3]

The instrumental cause, on the other hand, does not create or produce its effect through a process of self-modification, but through its activity.[4] In every creation there is also a conscious instrumental cause acting as the real force behind all the activities of the other instrumental causes. The activity of the potter's stick[5], as instrumental cause, in the production of the jar, for example, is

---

1. e.g. the transformation in the colour of the mango.
2. e.g. the transformation of milk into curd.
4. Tattvaprakāśikā p.3.
3. N.S., p.197.
5. Unseen or moral force has been held to be such as an additional instrumental cause in the creation of the universe. According to the Pramāṇacandrikā by Chalari Sesacarya (see An Outline of Mādhva Philosophy, p.73).

impossible without the conative activity of the potter. It is in this background, that, the role of a willing God in the creation of the universe may be considered as very signigicant.

<u>The Process of Creation and the role of God in it</u>

The instrumental causality of God (or Brahman) in respect of the created universe is like that of a father ~~and~~ in respect of his son.[1] His desire for procreation finds ample description in the Upaniṣads.[2] The Prakṛti forms His body and as such a desire in Him may understandably change or disturb the original state or that of equilibrium of the former, and cause the creation of the world-order. In fact, in our actual experience, the desire of a conscious individual, e.g., that of a human being, is found capable of effecting physiological changes in the form form of responses. The relationship between

---

1. Tattvaprakāśikā p.8 [?]; Cf. the Mantra
   योऽस्य पिता जनिता यो विधाता धामानि वेद भुवनानि
   विश्वानि च।
   quoted in Br.Sū.Bhāṣya p.6 [?].
2. Chā.6.2.3 [?].

the Lord's desire and Prakrti is, thus, rendered fully intelligible on the analogy of a soul (jīva) and his body.

Then, we are told that everything (i.e. both conscious and unconscious[1]) in this universe, as presently found in its created state, ultimately depends[2] on God Who is the cause or sole controller of its creation, sustenance and destruction,[3] being omniscient, omnipotent and possessed of unobstructed Will.[4] But, this dependence of everything

---

1. [illegible] Bhāgavata Tātparya 2.9.36

2. There are two forms of reality according to this school, viz. the independent (svatantra) and the dependent (paratantra). [illegible] Tattvasamkhyāna p.1 and [illegible] N.S.p.286 (cf. [illegible] Bhāgavata 2.10.12; ibid 1.5.20); dependence is interpreted so as to mean the dependence of a substance on another in respect of existence, knowledge and activity (cf.commentary by Jayatirtha on Tattvasamkhyāna). The universe thus depends on God as as its ground and ratio essendi, but not as cause in the narrow sense of the term: [illegible] (Vāmanapurāna quoted in Bha.Tat.p.13). See Philosophy of Sri Madhvacarya p.152; also cf. [illegible] Dvadasastotra by Madhvacarya quoted in Sri Madhwa, his life and doctrine p.159.

3. [illegible] Br. Su.Bha.1.1.2.

4. Karmanirnayatika by Jayatirtha p. 4 b (ref. to in Philosophy of Madhvacarya p.151).

on God, according to the school's theory of theistic realism, however, is quite different from the theory of the ~~latter (i.e. Brahman or God)~~ being the substrate of the world-appearance - as interpreted by the Śaṁkara school.[1] It is in this respect, that Madhva even holds the Lord as the non-dual (advaya) and sole reality.[2] In fact, the theory of creation according to this school merely extolls and reminds, however inadequately though, of the majesty of God Whose action causes the actualisation or manifestation of what is unmanifest or 'yet-in-the-womb-of' matter and in the souls.[3]

Māyā and Creation

According[4] to the Madhva school of Vedānta the term māyā suggests alternately (1) the independent

---

1. सर्वं [illegible] N.S. p.123.

2. पारमार्थिकसत्यत्वं स्वातन्त्र्यमभि[illegible] [illegible] Bha Tat. 11.24.1; [illegible] Bṛhada. 4.4.14; Cf. अद्वैतं परमार्थतः Māṇḍu. Up. 1.17.

3. [illegible] Chā. Up. Bhā. 6.1; [illegible] (Cf. Śaṁkarabhā. 1.4.14), [illegible] N.S. p.200; Cf. [illegible] Taitt. Up. 2.8.

4. Yuktimallika, verses 2.321-331.

desire[1] and omnipotence of God, (2) unconscious primordial matter (jaḍa prakṛti)[2] which is the material cause of this universe, as we have seen above, and (3) ignorance (ajñāna) which is responsible for the jīvas' deception.[3] It is clear from the above, that, māyā has been conceived here as the suprarational or mysterious power of God, being His mental capacity for the creation of the universe. Besides, this very latent creative power (śakti) has to undergo manifestation or patency (vyakti) at the time of creation.[4]

We may as well conclude, that creation is a real or metaphysical fact (like God Himself),[5] originating

---

1. इच्छा मात्रामयाय च Rāmapūrva; [illegible] अस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वमेतत् Śve.4.9.
2. Śve.4.10; Cūlikā 3.
3. अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते Māṇḍūkyakā. 1.16; माययापहृतज्ञाना: B.G.7.15
   भ्रामयन्सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि मायया B.G.18.61.
4. [illegible] Anuvyākhyāna 1.2.
5. [illegible] यदि जगत् [illegible] स्यात् तदा [illegible] (1) जन्माद्यस्य [illegible] (2) [illegible] (3) लोक-

out of the material causality of Prakṛti (or māyā) and subservient to the Will of the Lord.

7. External Realities and Creation

The acquiring of a new trait or quality[1] that depends on the will of the independent Super-soul (i.e., God), has got to be accepted also[2] in the case of the eternal realities or substances like time, space, matter, souls and the Vedas which are never created

---

वत्। इति सूत्रे आप्तकामत्व च प्रयोजनाद्यपेक्षेऽपि [illegible] (4) वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये नेति सूत्रे [illegible] (5) तेन आदेर्वा- [illegible] (6) [illegible] स्यात्। न हि [illegible] [illegible] प्रवृत्तं वा तत्प्राप्तेः प्रयोजनापेक्षा वा।
Nyāyāmṛta by Vyāsatīrtha p.246. (quoted in *Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya* p.149)

1. See the section on the concept of causation (para 2) on pp. 297-98 earlier.

2. नन्वेतदयुक्तम्, नित्यस्य पराधीनतासंभवादित्यत आह [illegible] तथा अनित्यं [illegible] नित्यत्वतया नियम्यते तथा [illegible] नित्यात्मना नित्यं सर्वदेश्वरो नियामकोऽपि। [illegible] नित्यस्वभावा अपि [illegible] [illegible] विनाशसम्भवात्। [illegible] नित्यता [illegible] पराधीनं [illegible] पराधीनेति [illegible] [illegible] तथा नित्यस्य नित्यत्वमपि [illegible] [illegible] नियम्यत इति' N. [illegible] p. [illegible] quoted in Phil. of [illegible] Madhvācārya p. [illegible]

in the sense that they always exist in their subtle, unmanifest or uncreated state even before the creation takes place[1]. Thus, creation does take place only in respect of a new trait (dharma) in them and not in respect to the latter's substratum.[2]

The Individual Souls and Creation

It may be interesting, now, to deal with the souls[3] (jīvas) from the view point of the Mādhva theory of creation as discussed in the preceding

---

1. Cf. f.n. 1 in Philosophy of Sri Madhvacārya, p.156, [illegible]

2. See Philosophy of Sri Madhvacārya, a lucid and detailed discussion of the concept of अपूर्वविशेषजनन, पराधीनविशेषावाप्ति in respect of नित्यपदार्थ; Cf. also अपूर्वविशेषजनने हि [illegible] M.S. p.431; [illegible] Anuvya. 2.3.

[illegible] Anuvyā. [illegible]

3. Like Rāmānuja, Madhva, too, [illegible] Mund. 3.1.[illegible]; Kauṣi. [illegible]

section. We know that the individual and jīvas are different from God and also the inanimate objects of the material (prākṛta) universe, as well as from each other among themselves. The conditions or limitations like the birth etc. (upādhis)[1] ascribed[2] to them in the course of their creation or origination (utpatti[3]) are only the distinguishing rather than creative characteristics, which give a qualified[4] appearance to the eternal and beginningless jīvas.[5]

---

1. जीवोपाधिर्द्विधा प्रोक्तः स्वरूपं बाह्य एव च । बाह्योपाधिर्लयं याति मुक्तौ अन्यस्य तु स्थितिः ... तथा उपाधेश्च नित्यत्वात् नैव जीवो विनश्यति । स्वरूपत्वादुपाधेश्च न भिन्नोपाधिकल्पनम् Tattvapra.p.119. Śaṁkara School of Vedānta.
2. Cf. the significance of the concept of upādhi (conditionary factor) due to māyā in the
3. जीवो ध्यात एव परमेश्वरादुत्पद्यते ... नित्यस्यापि हि जीवस्योपाध्यपेक्षया उत्पत्तिरुच्यते Br.Su.Bhā. p.83.
4. यत्सामान्यं जीवस्य यतो ब्रह्मसमानाकारम् । स्वरूपाण्येव जीवस्य स्वरूपाणि परमात्मनः Br.Sū.Bhā.2.3.31; प्रकृतावनुप्रविश्य तां परिणाम्य तत्परिणाम नियामकतया तत्र स्थित्वा आत्मनो बहुधाकरणात् Ibid.1.4.27;

5. Tattvapra.p.115.

The Periodicity of Creation

After being created by God the universe subsists for a period which is one-eighth of that of dissolution (√laya) [1]. This shows, that, this school, too, believes in the orthodox view regarding the fixed duration and successive order of creation (sṛṣṭi) and dissolution. The ratio of one and one-eighth between their respective periods, as against the normal concept[2] (e.g. that in Nyāyavaiśeṣika school or the purāṇas etc.) of equality in that regard, is noteworthy. However, this difference is not very substantial or material.

---

1. लयस्य त्वष्टमो भागः सृष्टिकाल उदाहृतः । तत्रैव वेदसम्भारोऽन्यदा स्तुतिमात्रकः । Bhā.Tāt. p.71 b (quoted in Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya p.164.)

2. Cf. आब्रह्मभुवनाल्लोकाः पुनरावर्तिनोऽर्जुन। मामुपेत्य तु कौन्तेय पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते।। सहस्रयुगपर्यन्तमहर्यद्ब्रह्मणो विदुः। रात्रिं युगसहस्रान्तां तेऽहोरात्रविदो जनाः ।। अव्यक्ताद्व्यक्तयः सर्वाः प्रभवन्त्यहरागमे। रात्र्यागमे प्रलीयन्ते तत्रैवाव्यक्तसंज्ञके।। भूतग्रामः स एवायं भूत्वा भूत्वा प्रलीयते। रात्र्यागमेऽवशः पार्थ प्रभवत्यहरागमे।। B.G.8.16-19.

The Purpose of Creation

Although, God has no desires unfulfilled being omnipotent, yet, he creates this universe in his sportive mood. His desire for creation has been compared to the activity of a person who in his hilarious mood dances and sings[1]. The event of universal creation, thus, is a metaphysical[2] fact happening at a time when God Wills it out of his nature (svabhāva)[3] being overwhelmed with the feeling of promoting the good of the jīvas.

VII. The Vāllabha[4] School

The Concept of Causation

The Vāllabha school of Vedānta believes in

---

1. Br.Sū.Bhā.2.1.33; सृष्ट्यादिकं हरिर्नैव प्रयोजनमपेक्ष्य तु । कुरुते केवलानन्दाद्यथा मत्तस्य नर्तनम् ॥
   Yuktimallikā by Vādirāja p.242.
2. The falsity of the created or 'matter-of-fact' universe from the transcendental or absolute idealistic view point, on account of its being perceived, has been demonstrated as illogical and fallacious by the Mādhva School. Cf. An outline of Mādhva Philosophy by K. Narain (Udayana Pub. Alld. 1962) pp. 128-138. ※ द्वितीये श्रुतिप्रसिद्धे रीते । N.S. p.209.
3. ननु शक्तस्यापि परमेश्वरस्य तन्नियमानुसरणेकता कुतः इति चेत् किं कारणं पृच्छसि उत ज्ञापकम्? आद्ये स्वभावोऽयमिति ब्रूमः । ※
4. Liberal help has been taken from the

the doctrine of the concealment of consciousness and bliss in the Universe which is created by the will of Brahman through the process of appearance (āvirbhāva) and by disappearance (tirobhāva) based upon that concealment. This concept of causation is known as Brahmavāda. Creation, therefore, means the manifestation (āvirbhāva[21]) of the Brahman in the form of the innumerable souls (jīvas) with its attribute of bliss obscured, and that in the form of the

---

material information contained in An Introduction to the Suddhādvaita School of Philosophy of Śrī Vallabha (D.Phil thesis of the Bombay University) by Dr. B.M.Dhruva, in writing this section.

21. Cf. तस्य ह वा एतस्यैवं पश्यत एवं मन्वानस्यैवं विजानत आत्मतः, प्राण आत्मत आशात्मतः स्मर आत्मत आकाश आत्मतस्तेज आत्मत आप आत्मत आविर्भावतिरोभावावात्मतोऽन्नमात्मतो बलमात्मतो विज्ञानमात्मतो ध्यानमात्मतश्चित्तमात्मतः संकल्प आत्मतो मन आत्मतो वागात्मतो नामात्मतो मन्त्रा आत्मतः कर्माण्यात्मत एवेदं सर्वमिति॥ Chā.7.26.1

1. Aṇubhāṣya by Vallabhācārya 2.1.4, cf. ibid 2.1.6 where the created universe is referred to as possessed of [illegible] which is the nature of its inherent cause viz, B[illegible] Ch. 7.26.1

unconscious beings (i.e. inert matter) with its attributes of consciousness ~~[illegible]~~ and bliss obscured. There being no change (vikāra) in the real nature of Brahman even after creation, the essential unity or immutability of Brahman is not modified by the concept of causation.[1] In other words, although, the Brahman or ultimate ~~and~~ reality having innumerable forms of the above two categories, is 'changing' from the view point of creation, it is not essentially modified or transformed from the view point of identity between the cause[1] and the effect[2] or that of the nondualism of the Brahman.[3] This non dualism[4] (advaita) between

---

1. तथा च अप्राकृतादिगुणयुक्त एव अविक्रियमाण एव आत्मानं करोतीति वेदान्तार्थः संमतो भवति A.B.1.1.3; तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत इति स्वस्यैव कर्मकर्तृभावात् अविकृतमेव सुवर्णम्। दर्शयति च तैजसानि। Ibid.1.4.26.

2. A.B.2.1.14; Chā.6.1.4.

3. Tattvadīpanibandha ~~by Vallabha. Nirnayasa Edn.~~ 1.65-72.

4. Chā.6.1.4; Br.Sū. 2.1.14.

the effect (i.e. the created universe) and its cause (viz. Brahman) is without the touch of unreality or illusoriness (māyā),[1] and, hence, known as pure (śuddha).[2] The effect (e.g. the jar) is real in so far as it is the earth (i.e. essentially one with its material cause) and in this sense alone, the former can be described as a mere name produced by speech according to Vallabhācārya.[3] The concept of causation, therefore, according to his school, holds the universe (or creation) to be identical with Brahman (or God), and, hence, real.[4] The created universe or diversity of effects, cannot be non-existent or unreal[5] for we actually perceive

---

1. A.B.2.1.14; Ibid.2.2.26; Cf. Br.Sū.Śāṅkarabhā. 2.1.19 which compares the appearance of the universe from Brahman with the phenomenon of becoming spread out of a piece of folded cloth.

2. मायासंबन्धरहितं शुद्धमित्युच्यते बुधैः । कार्यकारणरूपं हि शुद्धं ब्रह्म न मायिकम् ॥
Śuddhādvaitamārtaṇḍa, 28.

3. A.B.2.1.14;

4. सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म Chā.3.14.1; भावे चोपलब्धेः Br.Sū.2.1.15; सत्त्वाच्चावरस्य Br.Sū.2.1.16.

5. Cf. असत्यम प्रतिष्ठम् ते जगदाहुरनीश्वरम् । अपरस्पर सम्भूतं किमन्यत्कामहैतुकम् ॥
B.G.16.8.

it.[1] The created universe has a practical reality, cannot be illusory in nature like the dream.[2]

We may, therefore, conclude that the concept of causation, according to this school, aptly given the name of avikṛtapariṇāmavāda[3] by Vallabhācārya himself, believes that the Brahman is both[4] the efficient and material cause of creation; as[5] the cause is real, the effect, too, must be held as real, because there is no material difference between the cause and the effect.[6]

---

1. नाभाव उपलब्धेः Br. Sū. 2.2.28; [illegible] इति वदति च [illegible] स्यात्। A.B. on ibid; [illegible] वासनया [illegible] तन्न। वासनानां न भाव उपपद्यते। [illegible] बाह्यार्थानुपलब्धेः। उपलब्धं हि [illegible] [illegible] वासनाया अभावात् वासनाव्यतिरेकेण [illegible] व्यतिरेकानुपपत्तिरिति। A.B. 2.2.30;

2. वैधर्म्याच्च न स्वप्नादिवत्। B.S. 2.2.29; and A.B. on ibid.

3. See An Introduction to Śuddhādvaita School of Philosophy of Śrī Vallabhācārya, pp. 122-123.

5. नासतोऽदृष्टत्वात् B.S. 2.2.27; Cf. Br. Sū. 2.2.28 along with A.B. on it.

4. Brahman is defined as the [illegible] from which the world has its origination, sustenance and absorption. Cf. Br. Sū. 1.1.2, 3; cf. Pū. [illegible] 6.1.3 et. seq.; Br. Sū. 1.4.23; A. B. [illegible] Tattvadīpa [illegible] 66 [illegible] Taitt. 2.7.

6. Br. Sū. 2.1.14; [illegible] कारण[illegible] न भिन्न[illegible] A.B. on ibid;

Brahman[1] and the Process of Creation

We have seen how the pure Brahman, untainted by Māyā, can create the universe according to the concept of causation in the Vāllabha school of Vedānta.

Just as, the Sun is not different from the light it emits, because, the two are residing in one and the same place, are related by the relation of inherence or intimate union, and also because the former remains the substratum of the latter while continuing to be in his own original form all the same[2] i.e. so the Lord remains in His attributes as their support so that there is no destruction of His own essential form or personality[3]. Thus, the above qualities of Brahman are identical with Him[4]. But, just as the light of the Sun is not Sun himself, because, we perceive them as two distinct things,

---

1. [illegible] हरिः पूर्वकाले [illegible] परे। अवतारी हरिः [illegible] ॥
   T.D.N.1.11.
2. A.B.3.2.28;
3. T.D.N.Prakāśa 1.66.
4. Chā.6.2.1.

the qualities of Brahman must necessarily be admitted as having different identity, and, therefore, we may conclude, that the Brahman and its qualities have both identical (i.e. quite de derived of them) from its causal or priorto the creation as well as non-identical (utpātya)[1] from the view-point of creation or production. According to Vallabhācārya, the dual[2] and non-dual aspects are both suggested in the Brahman by the scripture (śruti) in different types of statements[3], and the Vedānta is meant to reconcile them, or to remove the alleged contradiction[4], so that, no single word of the śruti is violated.[5] It is only in

---

1. A.B.3.2.28; Ibid 3.2.29.
2. Chā.3.14.2; Śve.6.8 etc.; Bādarāyaṇa admits these contradictory attributes in Brahman Cf. सर्वोपेता च तद्दर्शनात् — Br.Sū.2.1.30; सर्वधर्मोपपत्तेश्च Ibid.2.1.37; आत्मनि चैवं विचित्राश्च हि Ibid.1.2.28; Ibid.2.1.28; Ibid.3.2.23-24;
3. अणोरणीयान्महतो महीयानात्मास्य जन्तोर्निहितो गुहायाम्। तमक्रतुः पश्यति वीतशोको धातुप्रसादान्महिमानमात्मनः ॥ आसीनो दूरं व्रजति शयानो याति सर्वतः। कस्तं मदामदं देवं मदन्यो ज्ञातुमर्हति ॥ Katha.Up.1.2.20-21; अपाणिपादो जवनो ग्रहीता पश्यत्यचक्षुः स शृणोत्यकर्णः। स वेत्ति वेद्यं न च तस्यास्ति वेत्ता तमाहुर-ग्र्यं पुरुषं पुराणम् ॥ Śveta.Up.3.19; Ibid.6.10; यद्वेव साम प्लुषिणा समो मशकेन समो नागेन, सम एभिस्त्रिभिर्लोकैः, समोऽनेन सर्वेण तस्माद्वेव साम Br.U.pt.3.22;
4. The fact of Brahman possessing contradictions is for the glory of the Brahman, Cf. A.B.1.1.3.
5. A.B.3.2.29; and Br.Sū.3.2.27.

in the above background that the non dual or the attributeless Brahman is said first, to assume the form of attributes (or qualities) and afterward transform itself into the created universe (prapanca) through the process of creation.[1]

Thus, in the theory of creation, the Brahman is extolled as the place, the agent, the source, the owner, the receiver, the various objects, the method, the time, the Lord of matter (Pradhana) and spirit (Purusa)[2] as all the effects of the gunas (sattva) beginning with mahat and ending with paramanus, as the attributes viz. jati, guna, visesa, samavaya etc. as well as the six modes of existence viz. production, (utpatti), continuation (sthiti), growth (vrddhi), change (parinama), decay (apaksaya) and destruction (nasa).[3]

---

1. Ibid.
2. यत्र येन यतो यस्य यस्मै यद्यद्यथा यदा।
   स्यादिदं भगवान् साक्षात्प्रधानपुरुषेश्वरः॥
   T.D.N.1.60.
3. T.D.N.P.2.64.

The Brahman as the cause of the universe inheres in the universe as Being (sat), Knowledge (cit), and Bliss (ananda),[1] respectively.[2]

Vallabhācarya says that this manifestation of the three aspects of the Lord in this three-fold creation must be admitted, because it is like the admission of the different degrees of Being which are actually admitted by all people even in the variety of the forms and functions of ghaṭas (pots) which all, ordinarily manifest only one aspect of Brahman, viz. that of Being, and because the other two aspects of Bhāna and Priyatva (appearance and dearness) are perceived by everyone even in the inanimate world (jaḍe'pi). Here also the

1. अस्तित्वादिप्रियत्वेन सच्चिदानन्दरूपतान्वयात् A.B.1.1.3;

2. Cf. सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तमानन्दं ब्रह्म Sarvopanisat 3; हृदयंगमानन्दस्वरूपम् Gopichandanopanisat 5, सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म Taitti.Up.2.1.1.; प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म Aitar.Up.3.5; विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म Br.Up.3.9.28; आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् Taitt.Up.2.9.1; आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात् आनन्दाद्ध्येव खल्विमानि भूतानि जायन्ते आनन्देन जातानि जीवन्ति आनन्दं प्रयन्ति।

will of the Lord is the regulator.[1]

The creative emanation and matter and conscious souls[2] from the omnipresent Brahman on account of His desire for sport, has been described through the common supptural image[3] of the sparks coming out of fire.[4]

The universe is created by the Lord due to His power (i.e. that of manifestation or āvirbhāva) as explained in the preceding section).[5] Through the act of creation which consists in the concealment of the attribute of Bliss and Consciousness

---

1. Eng Translation of A.B.11.3 by Dr.B.M.Dhruva (An intro.to the Suddha.school of phi.of Sri Vallabha.p.41)

2. (i) The emanation of the soul like a spark is not (strictly speaking) creation due to the absence of relation with names and forms. (ii) The souls are formless (nirākāra) because the phase of bliss (ānanda) forming their essence (as pointed to above) is a latent rather than manifest character. Cf. T.D.N.137-30

3. यथाग्नेर्ज्वलतः सर्वा दिशो विस्फुलिंगा विप्रतिष्ठेरन्
Kau.Up.3.3.; Ibid 4.20.

4. A.B.2.3.43; Ibid.2.3.17;

5. प्रपञ्चो भगवत्कार्यस्तद्रूपो माययाऽभवत् T.D.N.1.2.3;
In order to (samsara) of the jiva is admitted due to we have already seen the power of ignorance (avidya) of the Lord.

the Lord[1] creates the universe in diverse ways:[2] (1) directly from Himself as propounded in the scriptures, (2) through the Puruṣa or Brahman as in the Purāṇas, (3) through His fourfold forms (vyūhas) as in the Pañcarātra school, (4) ~~He~~ through immediately becom~~es~~ing all the creation without any activity on his part, and (5) ~~He creates~~ through creating the realities of the dream existence for the jīvas like a magician.

That the creation pertains to both name and form (nāmarūpa) according to the Upaniṣads is well-known in the Vedānta. While the creation of forms has been dealt with by all the prominent exponents of the Vedānta, that of name has received unique emphasis ~~of~~ by Vallabha~~s~~ only. According to him, the Lord also makes the sport of names as part of the universal creation.[3]

---

1. The pure or attributeless Brahman is the creator or the agent of creation. ~~has been proved as creator.~~ A.B.1.1.2; न वातोपन्यायेन यर्तु शक्यम। तथा सत्यन्यथा स्यात्।...
Ibid; T.D.N.1.27; मृत्पालितयेव कर्तुं A.B.1.1.5.
2. T.D.N.1.36-39.
3. नामलीलया अपि न पूर्वत्र नित्यत्वं प्रपञ्चस्यपार्थात्

A.B.B.2.1.1.2; T.D.N.1.65-69.

Thus according to Vallabhāchārya, when the Brahman wishes to be many[1] for mere sport (līlā) during the process of creation He uses the power of manifestation (āvirbhāva śakti), and when, He wishes to sum up the universe within Himself during the process of dissolution, He uses the power of disappearance (tirobhāva śakti)[2].

The Purpose of Creation

Brahman sometimes ~~(i.e. during the period of dissolution)~~ sports within Himself[3] (after withdrawing the created universe[4]) and this is known as the process of dissolution, and, also,

---

1. Chā.T.26.1.
2. अनन्तमूर्ति तद्ब्रह्म कूटस्थं चलमेव च।
   विरुद्धसर्वधर्माणामाश्रयं युक्त्यगोचरम्॥
   आविर्भावतिरोभावैर्मोहनं बहुरूपतः।
   तच्छक्त्यादौ तु सामर्थ्यादिरूपं स्वेच्छया तु तत्॥ T.D.N.1.71-7
3. क्वचिद्रमते स्वस्मिन् प्रपञ्चेऽपि क्वचित्सुखम्। T.D.N.1.68.
4. T.D.N.P.1.68

sometimes He sports with pleasure in the prapañca (after creation or expands the universe) and this known as the process of creation.[1]

Thus, Vallabha, bowing down to the Lord, the worker of miraculous deeds, from Whom proceeds and Who sports as, the universe with all the (created) differences of names and forms,[2] and also indicates that the Lord's (i.e. Brahman's) sportive act of creation is independent (swādhīna[3]). The fact of Brahman being omniscient and omnipotent can be proved only if He is the uncontrolled independent agent of the world.[4] The Brahman's capacity to become all proves His supreme incomprehensible greatness.[5]

---

1. See f.n.3 on page 318 earlier.
2. नमो भगवते तस्मै कृष्णायाद्भुतकर्मणे। रूपनामविभेदेन जगत्क्रीडति यो यतः। T.D.N.1.1.
3. T.D M.1.1.; कर्ता स्वतंत्र एव स्यात् T.D.N.1.77; स्वातन्त्र्याभावेन प्रभुत्व कर्तृत्वायोगात्.B.1.1.5.
4. तस्मात्सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वशक्तिमत्त्वं च सिद्ध्येत् निरंकुशत्वात्.B.1.1.2.
5. सर्वभावसमर्थत्वादचिन्त्यैश्वर्यवद् बृहत्। Ibid.

It is clear from the above that the creatorship of Brahman which is a real fact,[1] is due to His fundamental Will for sports only[2] according to the theory of creation in this school.

Then, it may not be out of place to mention here, that, according to the Vāllabha school, the Lord creates the laws and rules regarding good and bad actions and their rewards and punishments, and the souls who are concerned with these laws are willed to be so by the Lord Himself. He wills to have the maryādāmārga,[3] and, therefore, the dissimilarities in happiness or unhapiness of the created universe are not unreasonably partial or cruel in the context of the purpose of creation as propounded in this school.[4]

---

1. Cf. चोक्ता अनुभवो   T.D.N. 1.27.

2. Br.Sū.2.1.33; cf. also Bṛ.Upa.1.4.3

3. But, some souls are created under this very krīḍā or līlā, as solely dependent on the grace of the Lord, who are not governed by this maryādāmārga. Cf. Vidvanmaṇḍana by Viṭṭhalanātha (Nirnayasagara Ed.1926) ~~p.184.~~ p.164.

4. Cf. An Intro. to the Śuddhā. Sch. of Phil. of Sri Vallabha, p.46.

VIII. Conclusion

After the above critical and systematic study of the salient features of the theory of creation according to the prominent ācāryas of the Vedānta we may conclude this chapter by making the following general observations:-

(a) The approach towards the fundamental problem of reality or existence of the different ācāryas, inevitably and overwhelmingly shapes the theories of creation in their respective schools. Thus:-

(i) According to Śaṁkara, the only reality or the Brahman has no forms or qualities and the appearance of the manifold conscious and unconscious beings is only illusory due to the power of māyā by way of the superimposition of the effects upon the cause — which alone is real from the viewpoint of absolute non-dualism (kevalādvaita). Thus, the so-called created universe being simply unreal, there cannot be any transformation

(pariṇāma) according to this school's theory of creation.

(ii) According to Bhāskara's view-point of identity-in-difference (bhedābheda), the ultimate reality or Brahman as the conscious agent or instrumental cause transforms Himself as the material cause into the manifold effects of the created universe due to his very nature or inherent powers. Thus, the effects come into being through the process of a real transformation (pariṇāma) of and by, the essentially non-different sole reality viz. the Brahman, according to the theory of creation in this school.

(iii) According to Rāmānuja's view-point of qualified non-dualism (viśiṣṭādvaita), although the ultimate principle or reality (i.e. Brahman) essentially always retained

His identity, yet, all the same, He has forms viz., those of the conscious and the unconscious beings which get manifested during the gross state of creation, and remain unmanifest during their causal or minute state of dissolution. The manifest universe has, thus, no independent existence and is accepted only as forming the body and modes or attributes of the non-dual Brahman. This is why, transformation (pariṇāma) pertains to the state of avasthā (i.e. from the gross to the unmanifest and vice versa) of the infinite modes or characteristics (in the form of the above-mentioned conscious and unconscious beings) of the sole reality (viz. Brahman) according to this theory of creation in this School.

(iv) According to Nimbārka's view_point of mutual distinctness and non-difference (dvaitādvaita), although (1) the Paramātman (or Brahman), (2) the individual self and, (3) the material universe form distinct categories of reality due to their respective different attributes, yet, the (2) and (3) (i.e. the jīva and the jaḍa) are non-different from (1) due to the former's dependence on the latter in respect of their existence

and activity etcetera. Thus, the existing universe with forms is a transformation (parināma) of the Brahman as its material cause, in which the former remains without manifestation (i.e. without the so-called existence, activity etc.) prior to the creation. Also, the above parināma has been defined as nothing but the power of ejection belongin to the Paramātman according to this School.

(v) According to Madhva's view point of absolute dualism (kevaladvaita), unconscious (prakrti), souls (jīvas) and the Supreme Lord (Paramātman) etc. exist as distinct realities of the universe having their own respective attributes. Theory of creation or production of an effect, in this school, therefore, envisages a real transformation (parināma) both in respect of the (1)attributes or qualities (dharma) and (2) the qualified (dharmin) as the case may be. The Lord is only the conscious efficient

cause (just like the potter required in the production of the jar, for example), and the prakrti (forming his body being controlled by Him) alone is modified as the material cause. Thus creation according to this school [illegible] causality of Prakrti (or maya) subservient to the Will of God.

(vi) According to Vallabha's view point of the non-dualism of reality which is free from the illusoriness or maya (i.e. unreality) and, hence known as suddhadvaita, - the jiva and the jada as the effects, are essentially identical with their cause, viz., Brahman, but, in the jivadasa and the jadadasa they respectively have their quality of bliss and those of bliss and intelligence concealed or obscured (tirohita). Creation, implies only the ~~fo~~ process of limited manifestation (avirbhava) ~~three real~~ and disappearance (tirobhava) [illegible] of the Lord Brahman.

(b) Somehow, the conscious[1] eternal creator

---

1. The 'desire' or 'will' factor is self-evident in such a conscious or intelligent principle.

having supreme energy, or omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence etcetera is universally (though with varying emphasis and degree in each school) accepted as having a significant role in the theory of creation of all these schools. Also, orthodox theism especially in its later developments of the devotion (bhakti) movement seems to have deeply influenced the concept and role of God in the general theory of creation as propounded in the Vedanta. Thus:

(i) Even Śaṁkaravedānta accepts the power or energy in the form of avidyā or māyā, which, from the practical level of created existence, makes possible the appearance of the manifold names and forms upon the basically pure, unconditioned absolute Brahman.

(ii) The Bhāskara school even divides these unthinkable and infinite śaktis inherent in Brahman, into two kinds each being held responsible for the creations of the animate as well as inanimate beings respectively, from and by Him. God is, thus, recognised as both the material and the efficient

cause of creation.

(iii) Then, Rāmānuja is well-known for being a staunch believer in the real and infinite aspects auspicious attributes of such a Creator God, Who is ever qualified by both the inanimate and animate beings of the created universe in a manifest or gross state during creation, and in an unmanifest state before creation (i.e. during the period of dissolution). His school contributes to the better applicability or understanding of the role of Brahman or God by postulating the permanent existence of effects as His actual characterstics or modes on the analogy of the worldly objects (e.g. the mode of redness etc. in the jar is ever present with the jar which it qualifies).

(iv) Then, the Nimbārka school quite appealingly and interestingly believes God to possess the qualities of jñāna, śakti, bala, aiśvarya, tejas and vīrya for being able to play His extraordinary and complex role in accordance with the theory of creation propounded in the Vedānta. Above all,

this school emphasizes the dependence of all existence and activity in the universe upon Him, and the fact of the unobstructability of His Will.

(v) The Mādhva school accepts God as being the conscious instrumental cause, as being omnipotent and omniscient, and also as having an obstructed will. But, He is only the supervisor of the phenomenon of creation, subsistence and destruction materially taking place in the unconscious matter (i.e. the prakṛti) as well as in the souls (i.e. the jīvas). The most distinctive contribution of this school, however, in respect of the role of Brahman or God in the theory of creation, is the explanation or illustration of the special relationship between God's desire and the transformations (pariṇāma) of Prakṛti in the process of creation, on the analogy of that between the desire of a conscious being and the bodily responses (e.g. the movement of the feet etcetera) controlled by him.

(vi) The Vāllabha school of Vedānta, while accepting Brahman or God as both the efficient and

material cause of creation, emphasizes the purity i.e. non illusoriness or reality of the created beings (in sharp contrast to the extreme viewpoint of the Śaṁkara school of Vedānta) in comparision to their common cause viz., Brahman or God. Further, the theory of creation, here remarkably establishes a personal God, Who, having the three oft-repeated scriptural aspects all-embracing (if we may use the term) of existence (sat), consciousness or intelligence (cit) and bliss (ananda) ever manifests and obscures or conceals his aspects (in the infinite ways and degrees even like the sun spreads and withdraws his rays in our day-to-day experience. All the created beings, including the prakrti and the purusas etc. are as much inherent or related to their original cause (viz. the God) as the light is to the sun. It is only in this school of Vedānta, that we find, the reality of the phenomenal existences or the created universe brilliantly reconciled to the all-pervasiveness and immutability of the creator God or Brahman.

(c) The purpose of creation in respect of the jivas, is to make possible the experience of pleasure and pain etcetera accruing from their beginningless adrsta or destiny, in accordance with the well-known orthodox Indian doctrine of the law of Karman. The motive behind the Brahman's or God's activity or role in the theory of creation as propounded by the different schools of Vedanta, is none else than mere sport or playfulness.

(d) We find that the different schools of Vedanta attach paramount importance to a systematic approach and synthetic interpretation of the statements found in the scriptures and allied or traditional literature (viz. the smrti, purana, itihasa etc.) based on them (especially the prasthanatrayi as have been mentioned at the beginning of this chapter) which they hold as unassailable and having highest authenticity. In this respect and with special reference to the theory of creation (Cf. the regard in which the Purvamimamsakar hold the Veda and the sacrificial rites enjoined in them) the Vedanta is undoubtedly far more orthodox or conservative than the other similar

schools of Indian Philosophy.

(e) The normal orthodox concepts regarding the cyclic order and periodicity of creation and dissolution, as well as the general similarity in the names and forms of the regions, the different classes of living beings (including the gods etc.) and the inert material objects of the universe - during each period of their created existence, are duly accepted in the Vedānta.

(f) The Vedānta, like any other orthodox school of Indian Philosophy, is characteristically concerned with the fundamental problem of the nature of the ultimate reality, and more so with that of the achievement of highest or absolute (Cf. the inclination of the ācāryas of the Vedānta towards non-dualism or some form of unity or harmony in the universe as a whole) knowledge from the spiritual or religious view point, than with a detailed analysis of the physical matter-of-fact universe (Cf. the theory of creation in this regard in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika), or with finding the simple 'status-quo' basis for our common or mundane secular as well as religious performances (Cf. the theory of creation in this regard in the Pūrvamīmāṃsā), or with postulating

a purely intellectual and largely atheistic (and, hence unpalatable to the predominantly religious populace of the orthodox Indians) solution of the problem of creation. It is in the above background, that, we can appreciate the theory of creation in the Vedānta in its true perspective.

(g) The Vedānta (especially that of the Śaṁkara school) can justifiably, perhaps, claim ~~as~~ to representing the highest state of the spritual advancement of an enquirer of the ultimate truth or knowledge, and as such, its theory of creation, based on the perfect serenity of the idealistic non-dualism, or even on the divine harmony and rather quiet or intimate relationship among the manifold realities of the universe throughout the various stages of their existence on the other hand - may also call for our highest estimation.

CHAPTER - VIII

Conclusion

After having critically dealt with the theory of creation in main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy in the unique background of the Saṁhitās and the Upaniṣads, we may conclude our study by making a few remarks on the theory of creation as revealed in the orthodox Indian Philosophy as a whole.

I. The Concept of Knowledge and Reality involved in the Theory of Creation in the Main Orthodox Schools of Indian Philosophy

Direct realization (aparokṣānubhūti) based on the complete knowledge of the phenomenon of creation - so intimately connected with the concept

of reality as a whole, is not only universal but one and the same. It will be, therefore, be quite helpful to acquaint ourselves with the concept of this highest or essential (i.e. tattvika or that 'pertaining to reality') knowledge (jñāna) according to the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. Thus, as already noted by us, the Vedic[1] Ṛṣis had 'seen'[2] the truth or the essence of reality as a single phenomenon, and then propounded the various theories of creation

---

1. Faith in the Veda and the traditional literature inspired by it is a significant feature of orthodox Indian thought in general. Cf., for example, स सर्वोऽभिहितो वेदे सर्वज्ञानमयो हि सः Manusmrti 2. 7.; श्रुतिस्तु वेदो विज्ञेयो धर्मशास्त्रं तु वै स्मृतिः । ते सर्वार्थेष्वमीमांस्ये ताभ्यां धर्मो हि निर्बभौ ॥ योऽवमन्येत ते मूले हेतुशास्त्राश्रयाद् द्विजः । स साधुभिर्बहिष्कार्यो नास्तिको वेदनिन्दकः ॥ Ibid 2.10-11.

2. Cf., for example, the well-known instance of the imparting of the divine eye (divyacaksu) by the Lord to Arjuna for the seeing of His Universal form (viśarupadarśana) in the B.G. Ch.XI.

based on its different visions. In this context it may be interesting to note in the words of Mm.Dr.Gopinath Kaviraj, that 'the prime characterestic of this super-sensuous knowledge is....its immediacy and intense clarity. According to all the systems such knowledge is considered transcendental, being held to be free from the time and space limitations which are imposed as a matter of necessity on all inferior knowledge and from the indispensible conditions which govern the origin or the manifestation of the latter.... This higher knowledge dispenses, in its rise with the need of sense organs and unlike reflective, judgment, with that of the rational faulty. It reveals the past and the future as in a single flash, and also the absent and the remote. Nothing escapes its searching sight. It is aptly described as simultaneously illuminating everything in every aspect and as eternal. (Yoga-sutra III, 84)[1]' Dr. Kaviraj has also most convincingly demonstrated and analytically described how this

---

1. Aspects of Indian Thought, p.2

supreme knowledge, called variously by the names of ārṣajñāna, pratibhā, prajñā etcetra, has been acknowledged and referred to not only in the orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy such as the Nyāyavaiśeṣika, the Yoga, the Vedānta and the Pūrvamīmāṃsā, but, also, in the traditional literature of itihāsa, purāṇa etcetera as well. Even the science of grammar, the āgamas (i.e. the śaiva and śākta schools), and the Buddhist and Jain schools of Indian Philosophy have been shown to have accepted the above concept in their own way.[1] In fact the rise of this knowledge signals omniscience itself which, again, is possible of being attained by the mystic or yogin who becomes the very ideal of perfect Humanity or Divinity in the highest plane of cosmic life.[2]

It is in the above background alone, that, the differences existing among the theories of creation

---

1. Ibid.pp.3-41.

2. Ibid pp.41-44.

in the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy may be synthesised as mere representations of the (often 'apparently-opposed-to-each-other') various stages in the spiritual advancement of the enquiry of truth or reality for the supreme or ultimate knowledge of the one phenomenon of creation.

II. The Different Theories Being Based on The Concept Of Adhikārabheda In Fact Point to The One Integral Phenomenon of Creation[1]

Also, the orthodox concept of ~~xxx~~ gradation or classification (adhikārabheda) among the enquirers of truth seeking enlightenment or perfection, as higher and lower, is a clear indication of the appreciation[2]

---

1. ॐ पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात्पूर्णमुदच्यते। पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते।। Śāntipātha to Īśopaniṣad; मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति Katha. 2.1.10

2. Cf. प्रकृतेर्गुणसंमूढाः सज्जन्ते गुणकर्मसु। तानकृत्स्नविदो मन्दान्कृत्स्नविन्न विचालयेत्।। B.G.3.29; न हि ज्ञानेन सदृशं पवित्रमिह विद्यते तत्स्वयं योगसंसिद्धः कालेनात्मनि विन्दति।। Ibid.4.38; अज्ञानेनावृतं ज्ञानं तेन मुह्यन्ति जन्तवः। Ibid.5.15; विद्यां चाविद्यां च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह। अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते।। Īśopaniṣad 11 हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्यापिहितं मुखम्। तत्त्वं पूषन्नपावृणु

of the utility and graspability of a particular view point, aspect or vision of reality alone for a particular section of society.[1] Accordingly, we find that the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy present mainly three theories of creation viz.:

(a) that of ārambha (such as in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika) at the lowest or gross plane,

(b) that of pariṇāma (such as in the Sāṁkhyayoga, for example) at the intermediate or minute plane,

(c) that of vivarta (such as in the Śāṁkaravedānta) on the highest or causal plane, which are based

---

सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये ॥ Ibid.15; न तत्र चक्षुर्गच्छति न वाग्गच्छति नो मनो न विद्मो न विजानीमो यथैतदनुशिष्यादन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि। इति शुश्रुम पूर्वेषां ये नस्तद्व्याचचक्षिरे ॥ Kena.3; कुलं पवित्रं जननी कृतार्था वसुन्धरा पुण्यवती च तेन। अपारसंवित्सुखसागरेऽस्मिंल्लीनं परे ब्रह्मणि यस्य चेतः ॥ Vedānta Siddhāntamuktāvalī quoted in the Introduction of Īśāvāsyopaniṣad (Gita Press Edition). उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत। क्षुरस्य धारा निशिता दुरत्यया दुर्गं पथस्तत्कवयो वदन्ति। Katha.1.3.14; एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोत्मा न प्रकाशते। दृश्यते त्वग्र्यया बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः Ibid.1.3.12; श्रवणायापि बहुभिर्यो न लभ्यः शृण्वन्तोऽपि बहवो यं न विद्युः आश्चर्यो वक्ता कुशलोऽस्य लब्धाश्चर्यो ज्ञाता कुशलानुशिष्टः ॥ Ibid.1.2.7.

1. Cf. Introduction (By G.N.Kaviraj) to Prasthānatrayaprakāśikā.

respectively on (1) the practical or material, (2) apparent or intellectual and (3) the transcendental or pure aspects or visions of existence or reality.

III. The Concepts of Time and Space as General Background

The vastness of space and time[1] forms a common background in the theory of creation in the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. The concept of the universe (brahmāṇḍa) as constituted by the various regions situated higher and lower in terms of space, and the concept of fixed and equal duration of the periods of each creation as well as that of the following destruction of the universe or cosmos is particularly interesting from the viewpoint of the concept of time - are remarkable in this context. Also, it is due to the unthinkable ubiquitousness of time and space, that, on the one hand, the cycle of creation (jagatprapañca) has been understandably

1. Thus, these are also known as the common cause (sādhāraṇakāraṇa) for all products. Cf. Tarka-bhāṣā by Keśavamiśra p.23.

conceived as beginningless from the causal aspect and on the other, phenomenon of individual creation has been held ascoming to exist again and again and within their limits and hence, non- from the aspect of each created universe as an effect.

The process of each creation and dissolution, therefore, involves only limited time (Cf. the notion of the past, the present, and the future) and finite regions (lokas) as necessary background of the existance of the material objects of the universe as well as the activity of the conscious beings.

IV. The Concept of the Created Universe as a Moral Stage Involving the Important Role of the Law of Karman

The law of karman, which sets forth, that, the activity of the conscious beings (jīvas), whether good or bad, must produce[1] their proper consequences.

---

1. Cf. the concept of every gross object or happening of the phenomenal world presupposing invariably antecedent causal factors behind it in all the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy.

during their life or continued existence throughout the beginningless series of birth and deaths,[1] provided these acts are done with a desire[2] for obtaining the fruits thereof, is universally acknowledged as a pertinent and basic fact by the Vedas,[3] as well as the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy.[4]

---

1. Cf. the concept of transmigration or punarjanma as a distinct feature of all the orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. Cf., for example, वासांसि जीर्णानि यथा विहाय नवानि गृह्णाति नरोऽपराणि। तथा शरीराणि विहाय जीर्णान्यन्यानि संयाति नवानि देही॥ B.G.2.22; Ibid.2.27 etc. Cf. also Ṛgveda 4.26.27 etc. Again, it is interesting to note that all the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy also believe in the eternality and, hence, the immortality of the conscious beings or souls.
2. Cf. यस्य सर्वे समारम्भाः कामसंकल्पवर्जिताः ज्ञानाग्निदग्धकर्माणं तमाहुः पण्डितं बुधाः। B.G.4.19
3. मा वो भुजेमान्यजातमेनो Ṛgveda 7.52.2; Cf. Ibid.6.51.7; ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके Katha.1.3.1.
4. Cf. the denotations like dharmādharma or puṇya and pāpa adṛṣṭa, apūrva, karmavipāka and maryādāmārga etcetera in this context.

The fact of Karmans producing due experience of pleasure and pain is most commonly explained on the popular image of sowing good or bad seeds, which, ineffect, cause correspondingly good or bad crops. Again, the threefold division of the karmans as accumulated (samcita), as those being consumed or having begun to produce the experiences of the present birth as as a whole (prārabdha), and as those as actually in the progress of being perpormed in the present (kriyamāṇa), could have, also, been symbolically suggested by the popular image of seeds or grains stored, those being consumed, and those only being sown in the fields. The unseen force of merit and demerit is held, either to directly guide the process of production right from the first products like dvyaṇuka or, at least, determine the pleasurability etcetera of the material objects of the universe. Thus, the orthodox law of karman wonderfully suffices for a just and moral atmosphere in the created universe by making each jīva to be responsible for his good or bad experience (sukhaduḥkha bhoga) as well as his gradual uplift leading ultimately to complete liberation from misery. In this way, the purpose of creation is easily shown to be as the good of the

jīvas in the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. The role of the law of karman, truly, therefore, is also called as very mysterious or unknown,[1] because, the conscious beings (e.g. we human beings, too), do not normally know or expect what is really going to happen or face them often all-of-a-sudden in the mundane life, being ignorant of their individual past deeds[2] in so many births.

V. The Concept and Role of God

The concept of supreme God, too, generally speaking adds much to the credibility and visibility of the complex and manifold process of universal creation and destruction in the theory of creation

---

1. किं कर्म सर्वः प्रकृतिजैर्गुणैः किमकर्मेति कवयोऽप्यत्र मोहिताः [B.G. 4.16], कर्मणो ह्यपि बोद्धव्यं बोद्धव्यं च विकर्मणः। अकर्मणश्च बोद्धव्यं गहना कर्मणो गतिः॥

   Ibid. 4.17.

2. न हि कश्चित्क्षणमपि जातु तिष्ठत्यकर्मकृत्। कार्यते ह्यवशः कर्म सर्वः प्रकृतिजैर्गुणैः॥ B.G. 3.5.

according to the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. Thus He is said to be the independent conscious agent causing and controlling the process of transformation or evolution in the inert primordial matter (prakrti) and to be beyond the limits of time and space which invariably condition the created beings viz. both the conscious ones (i.e. the jivas) and the unconscious ones (i.e. the jada). The powers (sakti) of God are mainly three fold viz. those of knowledge (jnanasakti), will (icchasakti and action (kriyasakti). In other words the causal operation implied by such a theory of creation makes it imperative for us to accept the order an eternal omniscient and omnipotent supreme Being. The Latters relationship with the Prakrti and its later manifestations. May even time and space are variously explained as the one substing between the jivas and his body or as that between a father and his son, or as that between the very qualities or modes

of a thing and the thing itself, and so on and so forth, according to the different viewpoints of the schools. Thus, the theory of creation is given a personal or (in a loose sense) even human colour by the above mentioned concept and role of God, who is either the sole (i.e. both the material as well as the efficient), or, at least, the necessary instrumental cause operative behind the process of creation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. ORIGINAL TEXTS

1 Aitareyopaniṣad

2 Aitareyopaniṣadbhāṣya, Śaṅkarācārya

3 Amarakośa

4 Aṇubhāṣya, Vallabha, Ed. Pt. Śrīdhara Tryambaka Pāṭhaka, Government Central Press, Bombay, 1921.

5 Anuvyākhyāna, Madhva.

6 Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad

7 Atharvaveda

8 Baladevabhāṣya (on Brahmasūtra)

9 Bhagavadgītā

10 Bhāgavata

11 Bhāgavata Tātparya, Madhva

12 Bhāmatī, Vācaspati Miśra, Chow.Sans.Se.Varanasi

13 Bhāskarabhāṣya, Ed. Vindheśwarī Prasād Dwivedī, Chow.Sans.Se., 1903.

14 Brahmasūtra, Bādarāyaṇa.

15 Brahmasūtrabhāṣya, Madhva, Saraswati Press, Calcutta.

16 Brahmasūtraśāṅkarabhāṣya

17 Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad

18 Bṛhaddevatā

19 Bṛhajjābālopaniṣad

20 Bṛhatī, Prabhākaramiśra, Madras Univ.Sans.Se. Part I to V.

21 Chāndogyopaniṣad

22 Cūlikopaniṣad

23 Daśaślokī, Nimbārka, Chowh.Sans. Se.113, 123.

24 Daśavādarahasya, Madhusūdana Ojhā, Jaipur.

25 Devībhāgavata.

26 Garuḍopaniṣad

27 Gītābhāṣya, Śaṅkarācārya

28 Īśopaniṣad (also called Īśāvāsyopaniṣad).

29 Kāśikā (on Ślokava).

30 Kaṭhopaniṣad.

31 Kauśītakyupaniṣad

32 Kaustubhaprabhā, Keśava Kashmiri

33 Kenopaniṣad

34 Kiraṇāvalī

35 Mādhvasiddhāntasāra, Padmanābhasūri, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay.

36 Mahābhārata

37 Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad

38 Māṇḍūkyabhāṣya, Śaṅkarācārya

39 Māṇḍūkyakārikābhāṣya, Śaṅkara

40 Maitrāyaṇyupaniṣad

41 Maitrī Upaniṣad

42 Māṇḍūkyakārikā

43 Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad

44 Mārkaṇḍeya purāṇa

45 Manusmṛti

46 Māṭharavṛtti

47 Mīmāṁsābhyudaya, D.T. Tātācāryaśiromaṇi, Kumbakonam

48 Mīmāṁsāsūtra, Jaimini

49 Muṇḍakopaniṣad

50 Naiṣkarmyasiddhi, Sureśvarācārya, Ed. Colonel G.A.Jacob, Government Central Book Depot, Bombay 1906.

51 Nārāyaṇopaniṣad

52 Nirukta, Yāska

53 Nṛsiṁhottaratāpanīyopaniṣad

54 Nyāyabhāṣya, Vātsyāyana

55 Nyāyakusumāñjali, Udayanācārya.

56 Nyāyāmṛta, Vyāsatīrtha, Nirṇaya Sāgara Pr. Bombay

57 Nyāyāmṛtaprakāśa, Śrīnivāsācārya, Nir. Sā. Pr., Bombay

58 Nyāyaratnākara (on Ślokavā), Pārthasārathi Miśra, Chow. Sans. Se III, Benares, 1818.

59 Nyāyaratnamālā, Pārthasārathi Miśra, Chow. Sans. Se. Edn.

60 Nyāyasudhā, Jayatīrtha, Nirṇaya Sāgara Pr. Bombay

61 Nyāyasūtra

62 Nyāyavārttika

63 Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā

64 Padārthasaṁgraha, Padmanābhasūri, Nir. Sā. Pr., Bombay

65 Pañcadaśī, Vidyāraṇya, Ni.Sā.Pr.Bombay.

66 Pañcapādikā, Padmanābha, Vizianagaram Sans.Se.III, Vol.I, II, E.J.Cazarus and Co.,Benares,1891.

67 Pañcapādikāvivaraṇa,Ed. S.Śrīrāma Śāstrī and S.R. Krishnamurthi Sastrī,Madras Government Oriental Series CLV, 1958.

68 Pañcīkaraṇam, Śaṁkarācārya, Ed.Bhāu Śāstrī Kāśī Sans. Se.VII, Benares, 1923.

69 Piṇḍopaniṣad

70 Prakaraṇapañcikā, B.H.U. Darśana Se.,1961.

71 Pramāṇacandrikā, Śalāri Śeṣācārya

72 Prāṇāgnihotropaniṣad

73 Prapañcahridaya, Ed. T.Gaṇapati Śāstrī,Trivendrum Sans. Se.XLV, 1915.

74 Praśastapādabhāṣya (with Sūkti, Setu and Vyomavatī), Ed.Gopinath Kaviraj and Dhundhiraj Śāstrī,Chow.Sans. Se.Varanasi, 1924-30.

75 Praśnopaniṣad

76 Prasthānabheda, Madhusūdana Sarasvati, Ed. Hari (Nārāyaṇātmaja) Āpte, Ānandāśrama Sans.Granthāvalī 51.

77 Ṛgveda

78 Ṛgvedabhāṣyas by Mahīdhara, Uvaṭa and Sāyaṇa.

79 Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā, Śālikanātha Śāstrī, Madras Uni. Sans. Se., Part I to V.

80 Śābarabhāṣya (on Mīmāṁsāsūtra)

81 Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya, Chow.Sans.Se.Edn.

82 Śaktibhāṣya (on Br.Sū.)

83 Śākuntalam

84 Sāṁkhyacandrikā (on Sā.Kārikā)

85 Sāṁkhyakārikā, Īśvarakṛṣṇa

86 Sāṁkhyapravacanabhāṣya, Vijñānabhikṣu, Ed.Rāmaśaṁkara Bhaṭṭācārya, Bhāratīya Vidyā Prakāśana, Varanasi.

87 Sāṁkhyasūtra

88 Sāṁkhyatattvakaumudī, Vācaspati Miśra

89 Saṁkṣepaśārīraka, Sarvajñātmamuni, Saraswati Bhawan, Texts, Govt.Sans.Lib,Benaras.

90 Sarvadarśanakaumudī

91 Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha, Mādhavācārya, Ānandāśrama.
92 Saṃskṛtagranthāvalī 51, Poona, 1906
93 Sarvamatasaṃgraha, Ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, Trivo. Sans. Se. LXII.
94 Sarvasiddhāntasaṃgraha, Śaṃkarācārya, Ed. Raṃgācārya, Madras, 1909.
95 Śāstradīpikā, Pārthasārathimiśra, Medical Hall Press Benares, 1891.
96 Śatapathabrāhmaṇa
97 Seśvaramīmāṃsā, Veṇkaṭanātha, Ed. P. B. Anantha Chariar, Sudarśana Press, Conjeeveram, 1902.
98 Siddhāntakalpavallī, Vāṇi Vilāsa Press, Śrīraṃgam, 1910.
99 Siddhāntakaumudī
100 Siddhāntaleśasaṃgraha, Appaya Dīkṣita, Vidyāmudrākṣaraśālā, Kumbhakonam, 1894.
101 Siddhāntasiddhāñjana, Anantāryavarya, Kalyāṇapura, 1899.
102 Śivamahimnaḥstotra, Puṣpadanta.
103 Ślokavārttika, Kumārilabhaṭṭa, Ed. Rāmaśāstrī Tailaṃga, Chow. Sans. Se. III, Benares, 1898.
104 Śrībhāṣya, Ed. M. Rangācārya, The Educational Publishing Co., Madras, 1961.
105 Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya (on Br. Sū.)
106 Śrīkarabhāṣya (on Br. Sū.)
107 Śrīśaṃkarācāryaviracitaprakaraṇagranthāḥ, Ed. N. R. Bhagavat, Oriental Book Agency, Poona, 2nd Edn., 1952.

~~108~~ 106 Subodhinī (on Bhāgavata), Vallabha.

~~109~~ 107 Śrutyantarasuradruma, Puruṣottamācārya, Benaras Sans. Se. 135

~~110~~ 108 ~~Sudha~~ Śuddhādvaitamārtaṇḍa, Chow. Sans. Se. Edn.

~~111~~ 109 Śuklayajurvedasaṁhitā

~~112~~ 110 Suṣamā on (Tattvakaumudī)

~~113~~ 111 Suvarṇasaptatiśāstra (Chinese version Translated into Samskrit by Ayyāsvamī Śāstrī), Paramārtha.

~~114~~ 112 Śvetāśvataropaniṣad

~~115~~ 113 Taittirīyāraṇyaka

~~116~~ 114 Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa

~~117~~ Taittiriyaraṇyaka

~~118~~ 115 Taittirīyopaniṣad

~~119~~ 116 Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣya, Śaṁkarācārya

~~120~~ 117 Tantrarahasya, Rāmānujācārya, Gaekwad Oriental Se. XXIV, Baroda, 1923.

~~121~~ 118 Tantravārttika, Kumārilabhaṭṭa, Pub. by Messers Braj B. Das, Benares Sans. Se 5, 1882

~~122~~ 119 Tarkabhāṣā, Keśavamiśra, Chow. Sans. Se., 1963

~~123~~ 120 Tarkasaṁgraha, Annambhaṭṭa, Ed. Hariharaśāstrī, Nand Kishore and Bros., Benares, 1930.

~~124~~ 121 Tattvadīpanibandha, Vallabha, Nir. Sā. Edn.

~~125~~ 122 Tattvadīpanibandhaprakāśa, Vllabha, Nir. Sā. Edn.

~~126~~ 123 Tattvamuktākalāpa, Veṅkaṭanātha, Benares, 1900.

~~127~~ 124 Tattvaprakāśikā, Jayatīrtha, Nir. Sā. Pr. Bombay.

128 125 Tattvaprakāśikā (Comm. on Bhagavadgitā), Keśava Kashmiri

129 126 Tattvasaṁkhyāna, Madhva, Nir. Sā. Pr. Bombay

130 127 Tattvasaṁkhyānaṭikā, Jayatīrtha, Nir. Sā. Pr. Bombay

131 Tattvatraya, Lokāčārya, Chow.Sans.Se.IV

132 Tattvavaiśāradī, Vāčaspati Miśra

133 Vaiśeṣikasūtra

134 Vaiśeṣika Upaskāra

135 Vājasaneyisaṁhitā

136 Vākyapadīya,Bhartṛhari

137 Vedāntakaustubha, Śrīnivāsāčārya

138 Vedāntaparibhāṣā, Dharmarājādhvarīndra,Ed.Ānanda Jhā, Akhila Bhāratīya Sans.Pariṣad, Lucknow.

139 Vedāntapārijātasaurabha, Nimbārka, Chow.Sans.Se.Edn.

140 Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā, Puruṣottamāčārya, Ed, Ratnagopāla
[illegible] Bhaṭṭāčārya,Chow.Sans.Se.113,123, Benares, 1906.

141 Vedāntasāra, Sadānanda, Vidyābhavanagranthamālā,Chow.[illegible] Vidyā Bhawan, Varanasi, 1962.

142 Vedāntasiddhāntasaṁgraha (also called Śrutisiddhānta), Vanamālīmiśra.

143 Vedāntasiddhāntamuktāvalī, Prakāśānanda,Ed.(with Eng. Trans. and notes) Arthur Venis, Reprint from Paṇḍita, Benares, 1898.

144 Vedāntatattvabodha, Anantarāma, Chow.Sans.Se.113,123, Benares,1906.

145 Vedārthasaṁgraha, Rāmānujāčārya, Reprint from Paṇḍita, Medical Hall Press, 2nd Edn.,Benares,1894.

146 Vidvanmaṇḍana,Viṭṭhaleśa

147 Vidvattoṣiṇī (on Tattvakau.) Bālarāma Udāsīna

148 Viṣṇupurāṇa, Gītā Press, Gorakhpur Edn.

149 Vijñānabhikṣubhāṣya (on Br.Sū).

150 Yājñavalkyasmṛti, Chow.Sans.Se.1967.

151 Yajurveda

152 Yatīndramatadīpikā, Ed.Vasudeva Abhyankara, Poona, 1934.

153 Yogabhāṣya, Vyāsa.

154 Yogasūtra

155 Yuktimallikā, Vādirāja, Nir.Sa.Pr.Bombay.

B. CRITICAL AND REFERENCE BOOKS

1 A Concordance to the Principal Upanishads and Bhagavadgītā, Colonel G.A.Jacob, Motilal Banarsidass, 1963.

2 A Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy, R.D. Ranade, Oriental Book Agency, Poona, 1926.

3. A Critical Study of the Philosophy of Ramanuja, Anima Sen Gupta, Chow.Sans.Studies, Varanasi, 1967.

4. A Critique of Mādhva refutation of the Śāṁkara School of Vedānta, K. Narain, Udayana Publications, Allahabad, 1964.

5. A History of Indian Philosophy, S.N.Dasgupta, Cambridge Univ. Press.

6 A History of Indian Philosophy, J. Sinha, Central Book Agency, Calcutta, 1952.

7 An Introduction to the Śuddhādvaita School of Philosophy of Śrī Vallabhācārya (Ph.D.Thesis of the Bombay Univ.), Dr. B.H.Dhruva, Baroda, 1960.

8 A History of Indian Philosophy, Umesha Mishra, Tirabhukti Publications, Allahabad.

9 A History of Sanskrit Literature, A. A. Macdonell, Motilal Banarsidass, 1962.

10 An Outline of Mādhva Philosophy, K. Narain, Udayan Publ., Allahabad, 1962.

11 A Source Book in Indian Philosophy, Ed. Radhakrishnan and C.A.Moore, Princeton University Press, 1957.

12 Aspects of Indian Thought, Mm. G. N. Kaviraj, Pub.by G. Mukhopādhyāya for the Uni. of Burdwan, 1966.

13 Bhāratīya Darśana, Umesha Mishra, Prakāśana Byūro, Sucanāvibhāga, Uttara Pradeśa Sarakāra, Lucknow, 1957.

14 Conception of Matter according to Nyāyavaiśeṣika, Umesha Mishra, Allahabad, 1936.

15. Critical Bibliography (or Mīmāṁsākusumāñjali), Umesha Mishra, B.H.U.,1964.

16 Hindu Philosophers on Evolution, Balkrishna, D.B.Taraporewala Sons and Co.,Bombay,1934.

17. History of Dvaita School of Vedānta and its literature,Vol.I II, Dr. B.N.K.Sharma, Booksellers' Publishing Co., Bombay, 1960.

18. History of Indian Philosophy, S. K. Belvalker and R. D. Ranade.

19 Indian Philosophy, Vol.I, II, Radhakrishnan

20 Madhyakālīna Bhāratīya Saṁskṛti, Mm.Gaurīśaṁkara Harīcandra Ojhā, Hindustani Akademi,Allā.1928.

21 Mīmāṁsākośa, Ed.Kevalānanda Saraswatī, Prajñā Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala Granthamālā, Satara,1953.

22 Nimbārka School of Vedānta, Umesha Mishra, Tirabhukti Pub, Allahabad.

23 Outlines of Indian Philosophy, Hiriyanna.

24 Philosophy of Sri Madhvācārya, Dr. B.N.K.Sharma, Bhartiya Vidyā Bhawan, Bombay, 1962.

25 Philosophy of the Upanisads, Govindagopāla Mukhopādhyāya, Calcutta Sanskrit Series IX, 1960.

26 Prabhākara School of Pūrvamīmāṁsā (D.Litt.thesis of the A.U.), Dr.Gaṅgānātha Jhā, Alld.Univ.Studies I,Allahabad,1911.

27 Prasthānatrayaprakāśikā (with introduction by G.N.Kaviraj), Kāśīnātha Jhā, Rāmā Chandrāvatī Śyāmā Mandira Trust, Varanasi, 1940.

28 Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources, Dr.G.N.Jha, B.H.U.,2nd Edn.,1964

29 Ṛgveda (Translation), H.H.Wilson, Vol. I to IV, Ashtekar and Co.,Poona, 1925.

30 Rigveda Saṁhitā; Hymns of the Brahmanas (Trans.),Max Muller, London, 1869.

31 Śābarabhāṣya (Trans.) Dr.G.N.Jha, Oriental Institute,Poona, 1963.

32 Sāṁkhyakārikā and Tattvakaumudī (with Trans.) Pub.by Tookaram Tatya for the Theosophical Society, Bombay,1896)

33 Sāṁkhyakārikā with Gauḍapādabhāṣya (with Trans.) H.T. Colebrooke, Pub.by Toorkaram Tatya for the Theosophical Society, Bombay,1887.

34 Sāṁkhyatattvakaumudīprabhā, Dr. A. P. Mishra, Satya Prakāśana, 2nd Edn.,Allahabad, 1962.

35 Six Systems of Indian Philosophy, N.D.Rājādhyaksha.

36 Some Fundamental Problems in Indian Philosophy, Kunhanrājā.

37 Sri Madhva, his life and doctrine, Sri C.R.Krishna Rao, Prabhākara Press, Udipi,1929.

38. Studies in the Vedānta Sūtras and the Upaniṣads, Raibahadur Śrīśacandra Vidyārṇava,Sacred Books of the Hindus XXII, Allahabad,1919.

39 Syllabus of Indian Philosophy, B.Seal.

40 Tantravārttika (Trans.),Dr.G.N.Jha, Bibliotheca Indica Series 161,Calcutta, 1924.

41 The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English,Hornby, Gatenby and Wakefield, Oxford University Press,London,VII impression,1956.

42 The Evolution of the Sāṁkhya School of Thought, Anima Sen Gupta, Patna Uni.,1959.

43 The Hymns of the Ṛgveda Trans. with a popular commentary) R.T.H.Griffith, Vol.I to IV, E.J.Lazarus and Co.,Benares.

44 The Karma Mīmāṁsā,A.B.Keith,Heritage of India Series, Calcutta,1921.

45 The Philosophy of Advaita, T.M.P.Mahadevan,London,1938.

46 The Philosophy of Bhedābheda, P.N.Śrīnivāsācārya, The Adyar Library, Adyar,1943.

47 The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy, Max Muller,Printed in Chow.Sans.Studies XVI.

48 The Philosophy of Rāmānuja, Dr.K.D.Bharadwaj,Sir Shanker Lall Charitable Trust, New Delhi,1958.

49 The Philosophy of the Upanishads,Paul Deussen,(Trans.into Eng.)Rev.A.S.Geden,T.and T.Clark,38,George Street,Edinburgh, 1906.

50 The Philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita, P.N.Śrīnivāsāchārī, The Adyar Lib.,Adyar,1943.

51 The Works of Śrī Śaṁkarācārya, Śrī Vāṇī Vilāsa Edn.

52 This Mysterious Universe, Sir James Jeans.

53 Vedānta Meṅ Bhāskara Kā Sthāna tathā unake Brahmasūtrabhāṣya kī Ālocanātmaka Samīkṣa (D.Phil.thesis of the A.U.) Dr. Shail Kumari.

54 Vedāntasūtra with Śāṅkarābhāṣya (Eng.Trans), George Thibaut, Sacred Books of the East XXXVIII.

55 Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā, Saccidānandendra Saraswatī, Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya,Holenarasipur,Mysore State,1964.

56 Vedic Bibliography, R.N.Dandekar,Univ. of Poona,1961.

57 Vedic Concordance, Maurice Bloomfield,Harvard Oriental Series X

58 Vedic Mythology,A.A.Macdonell,(Reprinted),Indological Book House, Varanasi,1963.

C. JOURNALS ETC.

1 Allahabad University Studies

2 Darshan

3 Philosophy and phenomenological Research

4 Indian Historical Quarterly

5 Journal of the History of Ideas

6 Journal of the Oriental Institute

7 Journal of the Philosophical Association

8 Philosophy East and West

9 Prabuddha Bharat

10 Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference

11 Proceedings of the Indian Philosophical Congress

12 The Advent

13 The Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies